DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 117 CE 029 183

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth B.
TITLE LEA/Prime Sponsor Relationships: Practitioner Suggestions for Successful Solutions. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Career Education; Community Involvement; Cooperative Education; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Job Training; Program Evaluation; Responsibility; *School Districts; Supervision; Teacher Attitudes; Work Experience Programs; Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Prime Sponsors; *Youth Employment Training Program

ABSTRACT

This monograph discusses seven topics regarding ways in which local K-12 school districts could and should relate with the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) Prime Sponsor in their particular geographic area. The seven priority issues were identified by participants in a series of 15 two-day mini-conferences conducted by the Office of Career Education and oriented around the general topic of "Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) and Career Education." Each topic is discussed in a separate section, which identifies relevant sub-topics/issues. These sub-topics are presented in such a way that both the nature of the problem and practitioner actions in resolving the problem are addressed. The seven issues discussed are (1) local education agency (LEA)/Prime Sponsor authority and responsibility under YETP, (2) differences in CETA's and LEA's philosophy and goals, (3) fitting YETP into the educational system, (4) creating a positive view of YETP among educators, (5) involving the broader community in the YETP effort, (6) work sites and work site supervision in YETP, and (7) evaluating YETP efforts. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

LEA/PRIME SPONSOR RELATIONSHIPS: PRACTITIONER SUGGESTIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL SOLUTIONS

ED203117

by

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education

August 1980

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Shirley M. Hufstedler, Secretary

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education
Thomas K. Minter

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 014 180

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1980

For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
LEA/Prime Sponsor Authority and Responsibility Under YETP	2
Roles of LEAs and of Prime Sponsors in YETP	2
Involving Program Operators in Constructing LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements	4
Helping LEA and CETA Persons Better Know and Understand Each Other	6
Providing Academic Credit for YETP Enrollees	8
Roles and Responsibilities of Counselors in YETP	10
CETA and LEAs: Differences in Philosophy and Goals	12
"Language" Disagreements	13
Serving the Disadvantaged	14
The YETP "Minimum Wage" Requirement	16
Three Additional Philosophical Issues	18
Fitting YETP into the Education System	20
Using the "1% Governor's Funds" for Linking	20
Joint Training of CETA and LEA Persons	22
Fitting YETP into Vocational Education	24
Fitting YETP into Career Education	26
Creating a Positive View of YETP Among Educators	29
Sources of Educator Resistance to YETP	29
Communicating Positively with Educators about YETP	33
Methods and Procedures for Reaching Educators with the YETP "Message"	35
Summary of Discussion	38
Involving the Broader Community in the YETP Effort	39
Why Should YETP be Viewed as a Broad Community Effort—Or Should It?	39
Concepts Important to Consider in YETP Community Efforts	41
YETP Community Collaborative Efforts: Examples of Practice	43
Involving the Private Sector in YETP Efforts	46

	Page
Work Sites and Work Site Supervision in YETP	48
YETP Work Site Supervision: Distinctiveness of the Problem	49
Criticisms Leveled at YETP Work Site Supervisors: The Need for Training	50
Training YETP Work Site Supervisors	51
The Work Site as a Factor in Quality of Work Site Supervision	53
Evaluating YETP Efforts	56
Concluding Thoughts	59

LEA/Prime Sponsor Relationships: Practitioner Suggestions for Successful Solutions

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
U.S. Department of Education

Introduction

During 1979, a series of 15 two-day "miniconferences" were conducted by USOE's Office of Career Education under a contract with Kirschner Associates. Oriented around the general topic of "YETP and Career Education," each miniconference consisted of 7-10 participants, approximately half of whom were from CETA Prime Sponsor staffs and half from local K-12 school districts that had entered into a formal "LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement" as called for in the Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) portion of the CETA legislation. A total of 135 participants, representing 71 communities scattered throughout the Nation, were involved in this effort. Each LEA participant had been nominated by her/his State Coordinator of Career Education as a person operating a good "LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement."

The original intent of this series of miniconferences was to learn as much as possible from participants regarding ways in which the "LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements" were being linked with career education efforts of the local school district. It quickly became apparent that concerns and ideas of conference participants extended considerably beyond that rather narrow topic. Since, at each of the 15 miniconferences, participants were allowed to identify for themselves the priority issues they wished to discuss, the result was that a number of broad issues were raised regarding ways in which local K-12 school districts could—and should—relate with the CETA Prime Sponsor in their particular geographic area. A total of 514 specific issues, problems, and concerns were identified by conference participants. Of these, 48 were selected as priority topics for discussion. These 48 major topics were further refined into 15 broad topics and these, in turn, into eight of an even broader nature.

Of the eight very broad topics, seven are discussed in this monograph. The single topic eliminated—concerned with funding problems—was removed from this monograph primarily because of its temporal nature. That is, since this series of miniconferences were held, some changes have been made in these matters—and much broader ones are on the horizon at the present time. Therefore, it was judged preferable to limit this discussion to topics whose basic parameters are likely to remain rather constant in spite of current and projected legislative changes.

Two things hopefully distinguish the contents of this monograph from other recent publications concerned with the general subject of "LEA/Prime

Sponsor Agreements" under the Youth Employment Training Act. One is that the input for the discussions reported here was obtained solely from that provided by a combination of local school district and CETA Prime Sponsor personnel *from the same communities*. Further, the persons supplying this content were primarily ones responsible for *operating* the programs – not for *designing* them. The second distinguishing characteristic of this publication lies in the fact that the topics selected are ones in which local school district personnel and CETA prime sponsor personnel share a *mutual* interest. Insofar as possible, they represent the *basic* issues to be considered in those communities where local school district and CETA personnel attempt to work *together* in designing and especially in implementing an LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement under the YETP portion of the CETA legislation.

Because of the way in which these seven broad topics were generated, each necessarily includes a number of smaller sub-topics. Insofar as possible, subtopics will be identified here in such a way that both the nature of the problem and practitioner actions in resolving the problem are presented.

LEA/Prime Sponsor Authority and Responsibility Under YETP

In five of the 15 miniconferences, participants selected, as priority discussion issues, ones related to the general topic of LEA/Prime Sponsor authority and responsibility. In no miniconference was this topic treated in a fully comprehensive fashion – thus, it is not discussed in such a fashion here. Instead, they selected various specific issues relative to this broad topic as the ones of most concern to them as practitioners. Both the identification of such issues and the ways in which these practitioners have found to resolve them should be of interest.

Roles of LEAs and of Prime Sponsors in YETP

At one miniconference, Elaine Metzger, Director of Planning for CETA in Bridgeport, Connecticut, provided participants with a long list of responsibilities for the CETA Prime Sponsor, for LEA, and for community based organizations that had been worked out by CETA personnel in the Hartford area. Following this, participants spent some time "brainstorming" what, to them, seemed to be appropriate roles for both the CETA Prime Sponsor and for the local school district in operating under an LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement for YETP. The results of this joint effort, in terms of *general* concensus reached, are as follows:

Prime Sponsors should be responsible for:

1. Monitoring and evaluating the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement
2. Fiscal controls

3. Holding veto power over LEA actions—and knowing when this power needs to be used
4. Providing technical assistance to local school districts and to community based organizations
5. Providing staff salaries to LEA persons assigned to YETP
6. Establishing criteria for selecting those youth eligible to participate in YETP
7. Certifying youth as "YETP eligible"
8. Acting as liaison between LEAs and CBOs (community based organizations)

Local School Districts (LEAs) should be responsible for:

1. Coordinating the work experience and the career guidance functions
2. Providing YETP enrollees with general employability skills
*3. Job Development
4. Reporting back to the Prime Sponsor
5. Accounting for payroll purposes student time spent in YETP
*6. Picking up and delivering checks to students
7. Developing student understanding of emerging occupations
*8. Developing training programs realistic in terms of actual community needs
9. Helping YETP enrollees develop meaningful work values
10. Providing YETP enrollees with specific vocational competencies that will allow them to gain entry into the occupational society
11. Providing YETP enrollees with job seeking/getting skills
12. Providing academic credit for YETP participants
13. Assuring that the work/education components of YETP are mutually re-enforcing.
14. Developing linkages with business/industry resources and using these in the YETP effort
15. Keeping the prime sponsor informed on a weekly basis

In the listing given above, the asterisk (*) indicates a point on which some disagreement existed among participants. Each of those instances are obviously in responsibilities assigned to the LEA rather than to the Prime Sponsor. In each instance, the disagreement was in the form of a feeling, on the part of one or more of the CETA Prime Sponsor personnel in the room, that this item was a responsibility of the Prime Sponsor, not of the local school district (LEA). Other than these three instances, conference participants—half of whom were LEA persons and half CETA persons—seemed to agree on this suggested division of responsibility.

Obviously, the list presented above will appear very incomplete—and, in some cases (Responsibility #10 of LEAs, for example) inaccurate—to those charged with major National conceptual responsibilities for the YETP program. The important point to remember is that, to these *program operating*

persons, this is the way it seemed to them responsibilities were being carried out. It is clear that, to most of these participants, the CETA Prime Sponsor was seen as primarily responsible for general management/fiscal/administrative matters whereas LEAs were seen as responsible for actually providing services and skills to YETP enrollees. Neither the CETA persons nor the LEA persons represented in the miniconference where this topic was discussed seemed uncomfortable with such general arrangements. Rather, they seemed to be in high agreement that this is how it should work.

Involving Program Operators in Constructing LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements

Both the LEA and the CETA persons in one miniconference expressed their strong feeling that *program operators* from BOTH local school districts and from CETA should be active participants in actually constructing the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement they are charged with carrying out. Examples of ways in which their lack of involvement in this process was causing them current difficulties were numerous and included such examples as the following:

1. Craigh Heninger (CETA Planner – Ogden, Utah) pointed out that Ogden's Agreement called for LEAs to "refer students most in need" – *but* the Agreement didn't specify how this was to be done. This caused them problems.
2. Ed Andrews (CETA office – Providence, Rhode Island) reported that the "performance indicators" for his LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement had been drawn up by "planners" somewhere, but that program operations persons such as himself had not been consulted. As a result, he felt that the "performance standards" themselves were unrealistically high and could not always be met.
3. Bob Brooks (LEA – Providence, Rhode Island) pointed out that, while a "program monitor" is called for in their Agreement, no clear specification is provided with respect to the exact program goals that are supposed to be "monitored."
4. Jean Abbot (LEA – Conway, South Carolina) indicated that, in spite of the fact she has large implementation responsibilities, she has been told absolutely nothing about the planning that went into establishing the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement.

These kinds of problems are obviously more serious when a financial, as opposed to a non-financial, LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement is in force. Participants seemed to be expressing concerns primarily with respect to financial agreements.

Participants recognized – and applauded – the fact that, in part, the vagueness they sense is due to a desire to leave as much control and direction as possible at the local community level. At the same time, they also pointed

out what seemed to them to be a definite trend toward an increasing number of reporting requirements being placed on them by Department of Labor (DOL) Regional Offices. Each such reporting requirement represents, in some ways, a loss of local control and the need for further specifications to be made in the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement. This problem appears to be particularly great when it is "performance standards" that are required by the DOL Regional Office. Participants expressed a related concern about what they saw as a trend toward greater and greater amounts of specificity being written into Federal rules and regulations for the YETP operations—each of which is apparently causing their DOL Regional Offices to request more of them.

Particular concern was expressed for program operators to have a participatory role in determining performance standards to be included in the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement. They were *not* resisting the concept of performance standards, but they do want—and feel they have the potential—to participate in determining the realism of such standards prior to the time they are promulgated as part of the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement.

In general, participants seemed to feel that, while they have an appropriate role to play in writing the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement, they are not meaning to imply that they want such Agreements to be written in a highly specific fashion. For example, Ray Jarrett (LEA—Ogden, Utah) reported that, as originally written, their Agreement called for each YETP youth to go through a central clearinghouse to determine his/her eligibility. This made serious problems for the LEA in terms of letting youth out of school for purposes of traveling to this "clearinghouse." They were, subsequently, able to initiate an amendment to their Agreement that called for Prime Sponsor personnel to do pre-screening at the LEA building level—thus cutting down greatly on the number of youth that had to be sent to the central clearinghouse. Had their Agreement been written in too rigid a form, this kind of modification might have been impossible to make.

A general feeling was expressed that, in many communities, the "program operators" are likely to have a greater longevity than do many of the CETA "planners." Several stated that their "planners" were no longer around and could not be questioned with respect to what various words in the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement mean. They recognized that the words, themselves, *are* important but are obviously subject to various interpretations. In general, they feel it would make for more effective and efficient Agreements if the program operators had an opportunity to be participants in making the Agreement. This feeling seemed to be especially strong in those communities where the Agreement was, apparently, something made between the CETA Prime Sponsor head and the Superintendent of Schools. Neither of those persons, of course, was responsible for actually carrying out the plan—and several reported that "agreements" had been reached which, in practice, simply couldn't be carried out exactly as stated in the Agreement itself.

Laddie Livingston (LEA – Delta, Colorado) pointed out that, in his community, the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement is regarded as a document subject to modification, as appropriate, throughout the school year. In this sense, Laddie feels he has ample opportunity to participate, as a program person, in the final wording of the Agreement. At the same time, he also indicated that the total number of modifications needed would likely be far fewer in number were he to be given an opportunity to participate in actually drawing up the agreement in the first place.

Helping LEA and CETA Persons Better Know and Understand Each Other

Participants in several of these miniconferences expressed their strong feelings that, while unwritten in any formal rules and regulations, an essential responsibility of both LEA and CETA persons is to meet together, on a regular and frequent basis, for purposes of better understanding each other's concerns and working together toward solution of their mutual problems. This need was most obvious when it concerned differences in meaning among terms both were using – such as "work experience" or "academic credit." It extended far beyond this, however, to the broader problems of helping educators better understand the total CETA system and helping CETA personnel better understand our system of public education. This, perhaps as much as any other single topic raised in the series of 15 miniconferences, was the one where greatest agreement was found among participants.

In general, these program operators felt that a series of joint orientation sessions should be held. Examples of topics they felt should be included on the agenda for such joint orientation sessions included the following:

1. Clarifying the meaning of YETP rules and regulations
2. Charting the organizational structure of both the LEA and the Prime Sponsor – and showing how each organization works
3. Explanations of the basic operating policies of both the Prime Sponsor and of the LEA
4. Statements, by both the Prime Sponsor and by the LEA, of aspirations associated with the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement
5. Frank and candid discussion of the topic of why LEA's and Prime Sponsor persons should work together.

Strong feelings were expressed by participants that such orientation sessions should be held at the *local* level. Several reported that, while general orientation sessions were being held in their States at the State level, such sessions seemed generally to wind up being primarily opportunities for LEA and CETA persons to complain to each other about each other – or, even more often, about the Federal rules and regulations that restricted freedom of operations for both of them. They felt that, when such orientation sessions are held at the local level, the "debate/mutual criticism" format is much less

likely to occur. That is, at the local level, both know that they must do *something* and their mutual concerns for getting something done tend to make them more amenable to working together.

Problems involved in actually conducting such mutual orientation sessions at the local level were raised frequently. The most common problem reported was that, at the local level, it is much easier to find agreement that the Federal rules and regulations are vague and subject to a variety of interpretations, than it is to agree on what the correct interpretation should be. The frequency with which Federal rules and regulations change was a second problem frequently mentioned. In spite of these problems, participants generally seemed to agree that, while it is unreasonable to expect that "experts" can be made available to conduct local orientation meetings, the program operators themselves can, given sufficient time, arrive at mutual agreement regarding what they *think* are the correct interpretations to be given to various rules and regulations. Further, they felt that, if they could write out written justifications for the interpretations they have reached, they will not be in serious difficulty—even when, at some time in the future, an authority at the State/Regional/Federal levels determined that they were wrong in their interpretations.

There was wide disagreement expressed regarding whether it is better to make local LEA/Prime Sponsor plans before the Federal rules and regulations appear in final form—or to wait until such final regulations are published before doing so. Those arguing for developing local plans in advance of the Federal rules and regulations pointed out that, by doing so, they were able to establish ideal working conditions and to learn that the *intentions* of both Prime Sponsor and LEA persons are good and honorable. Those arguing against such a practice pointed out that, if one begins with an "ideal plan," that plan may often be completely unrecognizable once it has been adapted to meet a new set of Federal rules and regulations. In general, most participants seemed to favor making local plans in an "ideal sense" over waiting until final Federal rules and regulations have been printed.

There was also considerable disagreement regarding whether local planning should be regarded as a continuing process or as a one-time event to be scheduled only once a year. Most seemed to prefer to think of joint planning sessions as something that should be considered as desirable throughout the year—not just in the joint orientation session held at the beginning of the Agreement's implementation.

Linda Harvey (Governor's Office of Job Training—Mississippi) reported that, in Mississippi, for their Balance-of-State operation, they began with a very careful RFP from the Prime Sponsor's office spelling out exactly what was to be done and the monitoring/evaluation performance standards to be applied. Then, after LEAs and CBOs had responded to the RFP, they held a one week orientation session for them so that they would know exactly how to carry out its provisions. When another participant responded by saying that

she would have preferred a situation where, as a program operator, she was allowed to participate in writing the RFP—rather than simply responding to it—Linda indicated that, at least in Mississippi, the RFP had to be approved by their State Planning Council and, of course, educators are represented on that Council.

An additional practical problem raised by participants was that, in many communities, the CETA Prime Sponsor staff finds it extremely difficult to find the time required to participate in any extended joint orientation sessions with LEA persons. The CETA Prime Sponsor is often faced with responsibilities for planning several kinds of CETA programs (with YETP being but one) in a time frame as short as two months. It is very hard for the Prime Sponsor to do adequate planning for all such programs—let alone participate in joint orientation sessions with program operators at the local level. Other participants, while recognizing this problem, pointed out that they would be very content to allow such joint orientation sessions to involve only the program operators assigned by the CETA Prime Sponsor and by the LEA to conduct and to participate in the joint orientation workshop.

Providing Academic Credit for YETP Enrollees

Of the 71 communities represented in this series of miniconferences, a clear majority were providing some form of academic credit to youth enrolled in the YETP program. Several, in describing their individual programs, included some mention of the problems they had encountered and the solutions they had discovered in awarding academic credit to these youth. For a community-by-community total picture, one would have to examine these program descriptions as they appear in the formal miniconference notes themselves. Here, only the broad parameters of the problem will be discussed as provided by participants in the one miniconference where this topic was selected as a priority issue.

First, participants, time and time again, pointed out that, for the work experience portion of YETP, there are not great conceptual difficulties involved in the "academic credit" question. That is, LEAs have, for a good many years, been accustomed to awarding some form of academic credit to youth enrolled in work experience programs as part of vocational education. Insofar as the "work experience" portion of YETP is viewed simply as similar, in its basic nature and purposes, to the work experience programs already operating under secondary school vocational education programs, there appears to be little problem.

The problems with respect to awarding academic credit for the work experience portion of YETP appear to be in two areas. One is those programs where local communities have attempted to make that work experience conform to both the spirit and the letter of the YETP legislation by making its basic purpose being one of *career exploration* rather than the *acquisition of*

specific vocational skills—as is typically done in vocational education. It has, apparently, been easier for LEAs to obtain academic credit for work experience that does *not* comply strictly with the law. The second area in which problems were reported here had to do with the qualifications of persons charged with responsibility for supervising the work experience portion of YETP. In those communities where a certificated teacher is employed to do that supervision, less difficulty in obtaining academic credit is typically experienced. While, to be sure, several communities are now awarding academic credit without such conditions existing, it is obviously easier, from the LEA's point of view, if it is met.

Academic credit for the in-school portions of YETP appears to be a different matter. Again, two basic problems appear to exist. One centers around the concept that, while it is relatively easy to obtain academic credit for in-school experiences tied directly to academic achievement in one or more of the basic subjects (e.g., English, Social Studies, etc.) it is relatively harder when the "topic" is stated in such terms as "career exploration," "decision-making," etc. The second basic problem here is that involved in making a special course for YETP enrollees only that is *not* made routinely available to ALL students in the school. Many school systems have rules that specify academic credit can be awarded only for courses that ALL students have an opportunity to choose. Some of the CETA participants, when this kind of objection was raised, responded by contending the kinds of course experiences they seek for YETP enrollees *are* ones that the LEA should, on its own, construct and make available to ALL students. Whether or not that is true is, of course, a debatable point. The presence of the argument is not.

Obviously, where any form of academic credit is awarded, final decisions to do so are the responsibility of the local Board of Education—not of the YETP program operators from either CETA or from the LEA. The local Board of Education, in turn, must base its decisions, in part, on whatever guidelines are passed on to it by the State Department of Education. The Superintendent of Schools is typically the person making recommendations regarding the awarding of academic credit to the Board of Education. Participants reported their greatest successes occurred when the basic rationale for awarding academic credit to YETP youth is that the *kinds* of experiences provided them are basically no different from the kinds of experiences the LEA already recognizes as deserving of academic credit.

Several participants—from both CETA and from LEAs—strongly recommended that a requirement for academic credit be written specifically into the "Statement of Work" portion of the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement. Their point was that, unless it is specifically written in, the amount of difficulty involved in doing this "extra" work is so great many will conclude that it is "unimportant."

As might be expected, participants discussed, at length, the issue of "elective" credit versus "academic" credit. By "academic" credit, they meant

credit that counts toward high school graduation. By "elective" credit, they meant credit which appears on the student's record but is not included among the basic units of credit required for the high school diploma. The Prime Sponsor representatives at these miniconferences were very clear in expressing their strong feelings that "academic" — not "elective" — credit is what they are seeking for YETP youth. Their rationale was that many of these youth will, eventually, be high school dropouts and will need all the "academic" credit they can get. To the extent that the "academic credit" requirements of YETP are interpreted strictly to mean credit that is directly applicable to meeting high school graduation requirements, it can be expected that relatively more difficulty will be experienced in negotiating LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements than when "credit" can be considered as either "elective" or "academic." This is only partially a semantics problem. In many ways, it is directly concerned with the intent of the law.

A final "academic credit" problem — reported by only a very few participants — was their feeling that it will be easier to find LEAs receptive to awarding academic credit for work experience carried out in private sector — as opposed to public service — settings. So far as could be determined, this was not a general problem. Where it existed, it seemed to relate more to past practices in vocational education that has seen most students placed in private sector settings for their work experience.

Roles and Responsibilities of Counselors in YETP

There is a requirement, in both the YETP law and in its rules and regulations that calls for:

> ". . . an assurance that employment experience opportunities provided will be certified by a school-based counselor as being relevant to the career and educational program for the youth being provided these opportunities"

Wide disagreement existed, among participants in these miniconferences, with respect to how this requirement should be met. Some of that discussion is pertinent here.

The major generalization on which participants in the miniconference where this topic was selected as a priority discussion item agreed was that DOL regulations should be written in such a manner that questions regarding how many and what kinds of counselors are needed in YETP becomes a required part of the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement. That is, they wanted the *question* to be mandated in DOL rules and regulations in a clear and up-front manner. At the same time, they wanted *decisions* on how this requirement is to be carried out made at the local level.

Very wide and serious disagreements exist, at the local level, regarding the meaning and correct interpretation of the requirement quoted earlier in this section. This ranges from an interpretation that contends any teacher is, in

effect, a "counselor" and so qualified to provide the required assurance to an interpretation that only professionally certificated counselors can do so. Among those arguing *against* a requirement that professionally certificated school counselors be utilized in YETP operations, the following were the most common arguments used:

1. Many of today's school counselors lack work experience outside of Education. It would be costly to provide them with these kinds of skills and experiences.
2. Neither the YETP law nor the regulations now specify that the counselor *must* be a professionally certificated school counselor. Why make a requirement that doesn't exist.
3. One doesn't need an M.A. degree in counseling in order to know—and so to certify—that a YETP youth's work experience is relevant to his/her career and educational program.
4. Especially prepared "work experience counselors" would be far preferable to today's typical certificated school counselors.
5. Today's school counselors are already very busy persons who wouldn't have time to do this job. Since 70% of YETP funds must go for youth stipends, there isn't enough money available to hire the number of new professional school counselors that would be needed.

Those arguing in favor of paying much greater attention to the regulation calling for participation of "school-based counselors" had an equally strong set of arguments including the following:

1. Decisions with respect to whether or not a YETP youth's work experience is "relevant" to his/her career and educational program require a high level of professional expertise. That, in turn, calls for such decisions to be made by professionally qualified counselors.
2. YETP youth have many problems, over and beyond those related to their career decisions, that require the presence and assistance of professionally qualified counselors. We should not have counselors for various kinds of "problems"—rather, we should have counselors for all *youth*—including YETP youth.
3. YETP youth should not be taken out of—or separated from—the regular counseling program available to all youth. If left in the regular counseling program, then it is both sensible and logical that the YETP youth's regular counselor make the determination called for in the law and in the regulations.
4. Any professionally qualified counselor ought to be able to deal with most problems youth bring to them—including problems relative to the relevance of work experience. This particular problem is not beyond the skill level of today's professionally certificated school counselors.
5. To bring in a new breed of "YETP counselors" into an LEA would create both confusion and animosity among educators. It is not necessary to do so.

Several participants emphasized the point that, in almost every school, a good deal of counseling is carried out by staff members who do not carry the title of "counselor" in their job description. This includes both classroom teachers and school administrators. In vocational education, the "teacher-coordinators" of traditional work experience programs have been heavily involved in counseling with their students for many years. Others argued that simply because some "counseling" is done by persons other than "counselors" does not mean that persons carrying the title "counselor" aren't needed in the YETP program. Further, they argued that the YETP law and regulations uses the term "counselor"—not just the term "counseling."

There was also disagreement regarding whether decisions regarding how many and what kinds of counselors are needed in a YETP effort should be made by the LEA or by the Prime Sponsor. Those arguing for this decision to be made by the LEA based their arguments on the fact that it is the LEA who best knows what functions various staff members can appropriately perform—not the Prime Sponsor. Those arguing the other way pointed out that ultimate responsibility rests with the Prime Sponsor for the success of the effort and that, because this is so, it is a problem the Prime Sponsor cannot ignore.

As the 135 participants in these 15 miniconferences described their individual programs, it appeared obvious that the issue of need for professionally certificated school counselors as part of the total YETP effort is one currently being ignored by many communities. It seems to be met, in many places, by asserting that regular classroom teachers—especially those from vocational education—can perform the counseling function called for under YETP. Whether or not this is true is certainly open to question. There is no question, however, with respect to whether or not this problem needs to be seriously addressed at the national, State and local levels. It is not going to effectively solved if it continues to be ignored.

CETA and LEAs: Differences in Philosophy and Goals

This series of miniconferences was purposely structured so as to involve an approximately equal number of LEA and CETA persons from the same 71 communities. One of the inevitable outcomes of such an arrangement was that, on frequent occasions, philosophical differences arose among participants. While, for the most part, the CETA "types" were on one side and the LEA "types" on the other side of such arguments, this was, in no way, always the case. On *many* occasions, those on each side of the argument came *both* from CETA and from LEA backgrounds. In spite of the fact that this did occur frequently, the general trends were, as one might expect, to see the CETA "types" on one side and the LEA "types" on the other side. The arguments will be presented here from that perspective.

Considering the structure of this series of miniconferences, the most important observation to make is that participants did not always disagree with each other. As a matter of fact, there was much, much more agreement than disagreement – which will be obvious to all who study the detailed notes carefully. The "disagreements" to be reported in this section are very minor – and very few in number – compared to the much larger issues and the many more numerous occasions where strong agreement was in evidence. It is vital that this section be read from such a perspective.

"Language" Disagreements

A good many of the apparent disagreements noted during these discussions were primarily a matter of semantics rather than fundamental differences in philosophy or goals. It is appropriate to begin with a few examples of the common kinds of semantic differences that appeared.

Among the terms used by both CETA "types" and LEA "types" where obvious differences in meaning often existed are the following:

1. "Title I" – to LEA persons, this usually means "Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act." To CETA persons, this typically means "Title I of CETA."
2. "Education" and "training" typically mean different things to CETA persons but, to many educators, these two terms are interchangeable.
3. "Work experience," to many CETA persons, is a single term with very unambiguous meaning. To many educators, it is important to think of at least four basic kinds of "work experience" and to clearly define which one is being discussed.
4. "Academic credit," to many CETA persons, is a generic term intended to mean credit granted youth by LEAs for their educational experiences. To many LEA persons, however, there is both "elective credit" and "academic credit" to be considered – and these have two completely different meanings.
5. Terms such as "counseling," "career decisionmaking," and "career exploration" are interpreted to have different meanings by many CETA persons as opposed to LEA persons. To many in CETA, these terms are simple to define whereas, to many LEA persons, their correct meaning requires lengthy and complex definitions.
6. "School files" is a generic term to most CETA persons whereas LEA persons want to clearly distinguish between "routine" files and "confidential" files.
7. The terms "career education" and "vocational education" tend to mean quite different things to LEA persons whereas many CETA persons still think of these as synonymous terms.

Several CETA persons reported these semantic problems to be still further complicated for them when, as many do, they find themselves working with a

large number of LEAs. Some of the LEAs they work with have vocational educators as key contact persons whereas others may find the school counselor as the key contact person. In such instances, because vocational educators and counselors also often use different professional "languages," the CETA person's attempt to engage in clear communication is further compounded.

It should be noted that, in no instance, did participants view these "language" problems as ones that could not be rather easily solved. In more than one of these miniconferences, participants demonstrated how to solve them very effectively simply by giving their individual definitions and then discussing their perceptual and semantic differences. The point they want to make is that such semantic problems *do* exist and that, if good working relationships are to be established between LEA persons and CETA persons from the Prime Sponsor's office, it is important to begin by identifying and resolving these kinds of problems through discussion.

Serving the Disadvantaged

Very clear philosophical disagreements were voiced in several miniconferences centered around the desirability of placing a primary emphasis on meeting the needs of disadvantaged youth. While a complete reporting of all such discussions is not possible here, the major arguments that came out most frequently will be mentioned.

Jim Woodbury (CETA – New Haven, Connecticut) felt very strongly that YETP funds should not be viewed as appropriate for use with all youth. His point was that economically disadvantaged youth need a real break of some kind in order to even get a shot at success. If some nondisadvantaged youth become angry because the economically disadvantaged are getting paid while they are not, Jim feels it is up to the LEAs to work on the attitudes and social outlook of their nondisadvantaged youth. Marilyn Wiltz (LEA – Everett, Washington) agreed with Jim that youth whose parents make $30,000+ per year should not expect to have the same chance at YETP participation as should poor youth who really need a job. At the same time, Marilyn also pointed out that, in her opinion, the parental income requirements of YETP are not realistic. Her point was that, by considering only *income level*, we are forced to ignore the extent to which parents are actually *using* some of their income to provide benefits to their children. Marilyn's clear impression is that the definition of an "economically disadvantaged youth" based solely on parental income is most inadequate indeed.

Jay Czar (CETA – Albuquerque, New Mexico) agreed with Marilyn that some middle income families are experiencing much more serious financial problems than some economically disadvataged families (in terms of availability of food stamps, no taxes to pay, etc.) but Jay also insisted that this has nothing to do with correct administration of the YETP law and regulations. The law and the regulations are very clear about who can be served and

who cannot under YETP. Jay feels that, rather than arguing about it, we should simply do our best to comply with the law as it is written.

Several other participants also expressed serious concerns that, by using the strict family income guidelines in determining the YETP eligibility of a given youth, we are certain to ignore the needs of some youth in the LEAs who, in fact, are even more in need than those who are YETP eligible. Polo Rivera (CETA – Phoenix, Arizona) pointed out that, when he worked in the Job Corps, there were "waiver conditions" that could be used, when professional judgment found it necessary to do so, to include some persons who did not meet the income eligibility requirements completely. Many examples were given by LEA persons of youth they knew who they would want to include were such "waiver conditions" to be made possible for YETP program efforts.

Similarly, when it was pointed out that the term "disadvantaged," in YETP, now includes juvenile offenders and persons with handicaps as well as the economically disadvantaged, more than one LEA person noted that they knew of several youth who, while not juvenile offenders at the present time, were almost sure to be in that category if no program such as YETP can be made available to them.

John Sedey (LEA – St. Paul, Minnesota) made the point that, in their day-to-day LEA operations, they make every possible attempt to integrate YETP youth with all others in as many activities as possible. To separate out the economically disadvantaged is, in John's opinion, to run the risk of reviving the "separate but equal" dangers of the past. Several other participants voiced this same concern – including some of those who felt most strongly about providing special assistance to the economically disadvantaged. Their point was that, while special help of many kinds can – and should – be provided to these youth, it is equally important to integrate them with all others whenever it is legally possible to do so.

Of course, a great many participants pointed out that, under the "transition services" section of YETP, there are a wide variety of services that can be made available to nondisadvantaged as well as to economically disadvantaged youth. Such services include counseling, occupational/educational information, and assistance in overcoming bias and stereotyping. It also includes vocational exploration so long as no wages are involved for those youth participating. Included among benefits YETP can provide are some equipment items. For example, Sandra Kelly (CETA – Everett, Washington) pointed out that, while they do not mix YETP funds with any other kinds of non-DOL funds, they do make computer terminals available to YETP youth in the LEAs. The LEAs, in turn, are making these computer terminals available to all other students *using their own funds* to pay the service charges while CETA pays for this use during the Summer with youth in the YSEP program.

In general, if one could say basic philosophical differences exist between CETA and LEA persons on this point, such differences would lie in a *tendency*

on the part of LEA persons to favor arrangements under which services are provided to ALL youth and a *tendency* on the part of CETA persons to favor special services for the economically disadvantaged. As can be seen from several of the examples given in this section, the argument does not always find CETA and LEA persons on "opposite sides of the fence." There certainly seemed to be general consensus around the following points:

1. Economically disadvantaged youth have special needs for help which justify—and even demand—that they receive some benefits under YETP not available to other youth.
2. There are, in almost every LEA, a number of "almost eligible" youth who could profit greatly if some way could be found to make them "CETA eligible." Unless some way is found, they may soon become eligible because we *didn't* help them.
3. The special benefits provided YETP youth should, insofar as possible, be added to whatever benefits they receive from interacting with all other youth. Efforts to provide YETP youth with "special benefits" through, in effect, segregating them out from others should be discouraged.
4. There are many opportunities for nondisadvantaged youth to receive general employability skills under YETP. They are, in no way, totally excluded now.

In part, of course, this issue was raised out of sheer frustration, on the part of many LEA persons, who currently find themselves inundated with a variety of Federal programs whose authors appear to be saying to the LEAs "WE know what the needs of YOUR students are." The LEAs, understandably, tend to feel that THEY are the ones who know best the needs of their own students and that, given "x" dollars of Federal resources, they are the ones who could best see that it is spent wisely. That problem, of course, cannot be solved easily in general—let alone in terms of LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements.

The YETP "Minimum Wage" Requirement

The "minimum wage" problem in YETP operations has both practical and philosophical aspects. This topic came up for major discussion in two of the miniconferences and was discussed tangentially in several others. It is obviously one of concern to both LEA and to CETA persons. The problem stems from the YETP requirement that, in the career employment experiences portion of YETP, eligible youth be paid at the minimum wage. The basic question raised had to do with the wisdom of that requirement.

The major arguments voiced by those participants who favored the "minimum wage" requirement for economically disadvantaged youth now participating in YETP included the following:

1. These are poor people. Even the minimum wage won't bring them up far beyond the poverty level. They need money. If you want them to work in YETP, you must pay them money. Otherwise, they will find money by doing things other than participating in YETP.
2. The "minimum wage" *is* the minimum wage in the United States. It is a figure carefully calculated based on poverty standards. Any attempts to pay persons less than the minimum wage will be highly resisted by organized labor.
3. By paying YETP youth the minimum wage, we make it possible for them to purchase some of the same kinds of "youth things" for themselves that their classmates have—e.g., pocketbooks, sweaters, tennis shoes, etc.,—which will make them more *like* their classmates than they could be otherwise.
4. Economically disadvantaged YETP youth come primarily from poverty level—or near poverty level—families. Some of their wages can, when coupled with other sources of family income—help lift some poverty level families out of poverty and into the main stream of society.
5. Because (in order to avoid breaking child labor laws) much of the work YETP youth do involves using hand tools rather than machinery, they really do earn the minimum wages they are paid. It isn't fair to compare their productivity with that of older persons who have machine tools available to them.
6. True career exploration is, for many poor persons, impossible to engage in without some kind of subsidy. Their need for money is so great that, without a subsidy, they will many times wind up "settling for" rather than "choosing" careers. They have as much right to freedom of choice as do all others.

The arguments voiced by other participants—who favored either a reduction in pay from the minimal wage or no wages at all—can be summarized as follows:

1. Employers have plenty of job applicants today in the 20-25 year age range. Based on maturity alone, they will tend to hire them in place of the 14-18-year-old youth in YETP. If YETP youth are to compete for jobs, they can do so only if employers are allowed to pay them less than they pay others.
2. Some LEAs now operate under special exemptions where some school employees are paid less than the minimum wage. They resent it greatly if some students in the LEA are paid more per hour than they are.
3. Many youth career centers operate in which both YETP and non-YETP youth participate in work experience. It's tough to tell non-YETP youth that they can't receive minimum wage when they can see that all YETP youth do.
4. It's hard to find work experience slots for YETP youth with the minimum wage requirement in effect. Many potential slots are now

being filled by employers who are paying other youth less than the minimum wage.

5. There *are* some exemptions from the minimum wage already in effect in our country. If there are *any* exemptions, the case could certainly be made for adding youth to the list. If we do not do so, youth unemployment will surely rise still more.

Some of the above objections were answered forcefully by other participants. For example, Barbara Preli (LEA – Louisville, Kentucky) strongly defended paying YETP eligible youth the minimum wage based on their great need to develop a set of general employability skills – including good work habits. Barbara's point was that, without the YETP experience, many of these youth are currently acquiring, for example, *bad* work habits which will further handicap them as adults whereas, if they can develop *good* work habits through the YETP work experience effort, it may well give them an advantage as adults.

Similarly, Ron Finnegan (LEA – St. Paul, Minnesota) reported that, far from discouraging those employed adults in his school system who were making less than the minimum wage, one of the "side benefits" of insisting on minimum wage for YETP youth was that it forced the school system to raise ALL school system employee salaries to at least the minimum wage.

The prime additional retort opponents of the "minimum wage" concept typically gave to those favoring it was that "we shouldn't pay kids to go to school."

Three Additional Philosophical Issues

Three additional important philosophical issues deserve some mention here. Each, while discussed only rarely during this series of miniconferences, provided heated discussion when it was raised. The surprising thing was that these issues were not raised more often.

The first of these pertained to the "22% provision" found in the YETP legislation that mandates a minimum of 22% of YETP funds received by a CETA Prime Sponsor must be spent in "LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements". Persons from LEAs, when this topic came up, were quick to point out that this 22% is a *minimum*, not a maximum – and that they really felt that more than this should be allocated for their use. Several CETA persons, on the other hand, felt that the "22% minimum" was much higher than could reasonably be justified considering the increasing numbers of out-of-school youth found in large urban areas. Their point was that such youth are not only out-of-school, but also typically out of work, out of luck, and out of hope. It is the extremely economically disadvantaged out-of-school youth that these persons feel need help if they are to become productive citizens in our society. They felt that economically disadvantaged youth who are still

enrolled in school have a good chance of achieving some success with or without YETP.

The second philosophical argument arose when goals of "employment" versus "employability" were discussed. Some participants (including some from both CETA and from LEA settings) felt strongly that the primary goals of YETP ought to be oriented around providing youth with a set of general employability skills that will be useful to them during their entire working life. Others stressed the absolute importance of getting some money into the hands of YETP eligible youth. Such persons repeatedly emphasized that, to such youth, a "job" is what they really say they want – and that a "job" (i.e., something that pays them money) is what they most need at the present time. They felt that, to tell YETP youth they are there to develop "general employability skills" would be unacceptable to the youth themselves.

Third, some philosophical discussion was seen in two miniconferences where the question of participation of 14-15-year-olds in YETP came under discussion. Some participants (again from both CETA and from LEA settings) felt strongly that, at ages 14-15, these youth should be concentrating their full attention on acquiring basic academic skills, not the "transition skills" provided by YETP. Further, they felt strongly that truly meaningful work experience was difficult to find for 14-15-year-old youth. Finally, they argued that, with limited funds available for use in YETP, it would be far better to concentrate efforts on the 16-18-year-old youth and that, even if ALL the effort were to be placed on these youth, we still would be unable to cover all those who are eligible. Those arguing on the other side of this issue pointed out that the kinds of general employability skills these youth need are ones that should really start being developed in the early elementary school years – i.e., that to wait as long as Age 14 is really waiting too long. They felt Age 16 would be *way* too late to begin this effort. They further pointed out that, if we wait until Age 16 to begin paying attention to YETP eligible youth, many will have already dropped out of school prior to the time they could participate. Efforts aimed at meeting career needs of out-of-school youth are far more expensive, per person served, than those aimed at working with in-school youth. Thus, these participants felt strongly that it is essential to keep the 14-15-year-old provisions and, if possible, to extend it to still lower age levels.

The interesting thing about this set of arguments was that it did not, in terms of any argument, come down to a "CETA vs LEA" kind of confrontation. Some persons from both "camps" could be found joining forces on each of these arguments. Perhaps this fact, as well as any other single thing that could be said, illustrates the complexity of issues being dealt with under YETP. There obviously are no quick, obvious, easy answers to any of them.

Fitting YETP into the Education System

Tim Reagan (CETA – Boston, Massachusetts) emphasized, in the miniconference he attended, that he regarded YETP, among ALL possible CETA programs, as the one holding greatest positive potential for establishing and maintaining effective CETA/Education system relationships. Throughout this series of miniconferences, there seemed to be a general – even though an often unspoken – sense of agreement with this assertion. The purpose of this section is to summarize participant perceptions with reference to a number of possible ways in which such linkages could be established.

Using the "1% Governor's Funds" for Linking

In five of the 15 miniconferences in this series, one or more participants suggested using the "1% linking funds" available to each Governor under CETA for purposes of better linking CETA with the Education system. Most of the suggestions made pertained specifically to YETP rather than to CETA in general. Several participants pointed out that these "linking" funds are, in no way, intended to be limited in their use to YETP. Others were equally quick to point out that YETP "linking" *is* one of the legitimate purposes for which these funds can be used. Similarly, some participants emphasized that these "linking" funds were established primarily for purposes of making linkages at the *State*, rather than at the *local*, level. While others admitted this is true, they pointed out that nothing precludes use of these "linking" funds at the local level.

The presence of this "1% linking money" which has been added to previously existing "5% vocational education linking money" found some of these participants unaware of the existence of these funds. Others reported that, in their States, these funds were apparently being used for various kinds of research projects aimed at investigating certain CETA problems and they did not perceive them as funds really available for use in making better CETA/Education system linkages. The vast majority of participants discussing this topic, however, felt strongly that these "linking" funds could – and should – be used, to a great extent, to help fit YETP better into the total system of Education.

The total amount of "1% linking" money available varies, of course, from State to State depending on CETA funding formulas. However, in every State, it amounts to a considerable number of dollars. As examples, Mississippi reported that these funds amount to about $1.0 million dollars annually, in Louisiana it is $1.2 million and, in Massachusetts, it was reported that about $1.4 million dollars is available for this "1%" linking effort.

Suggestions for use of these "1%" linking funds at the State level for making closer ties between CETA and the Education system included the following:

1. Fund research projects around topics such as problems involved in granting academic credit whose results could be applied to LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements throughout the State.
2. Fund a Statewide vocational education media center that could be used as a referral source by all vocational educators in the State.
3. Fund a number of Career Resource Centers in strategic parts of the State that could be used by both youth and adults seeking career information—and by both CETA and LEA professional counselors.
4. Establish and operate a State Advisory Council on CETA/LEA Linkages similar in nature to the current State Advisory Council on Vocational Education.
5. Use the "1%" funds to link the CETA State Manpower Planning Council with both the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education and the State Advisory Council on Career Education.
6. Conduct joint State training conferences for CETA and LEA persons aimed at helping each better understand the other.
7. Collect and publish exemplary examples of good LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements and distribute such publications to both CETA Prime Sponsors and to LEAs across the State.
8. Ask the State Career Education Coordinator to make up a plan for spending part or all of this "1%" money and submit that plan to the CETA State Manpower Planning Council for approval.
9. Construct both a CETA "Master Plan" covering all CETA programs that link with Education in any way and an Education "Master Plan" covering both vocational education and career education.
10. Use these funds to link with other Statewide "influence" groups (e.g., representing the handicapped, minorities, women, etc.) who are trying to influence both the CETA and the Education systems.
11. Provide demonstration grants to LEAs who submit the most innovative and potentially productive ways of working constructively with their CETA Prime Sponsors.
12. Provide a planning grant to one LEA in each Prime Sponsor area for purposes of coming up with ideas concerning how to better link the Education system and CETA.

While some of the ideas presented above resulted strictly from "brainstorming" carried out during the series of miniconferences, others have already been put into effect in selected States. No pretense is made here that all of these ideas can be converted into effective action. At the same time, as suggestions made by program operators, each is considered deserving of some consideration by decisionmakers.

Other "miniconference" participants expressed primary desire to use these "1%" linking funds at the local, rather than at the State, level. Their suggestions as to possible ways in which these funds could be properly used at the local level include:

1. Allocate these funds to existing YETP programs for purposes of increasing the number of YETP enrollees (without making any kind of *new* program).
2. Fund projects aimed at building *quality* career awareness and career exploration efforts for economically disadvantaged youth—as a supplement to existing career education efforts.
3. Mount a program of career exploration for economically disadvantaged 9th and 10th graders aimed at interesting them in enrolling in vocational education in Grades 11-12.
4. Fund career education efforts aimed at providing high quality career education to 14-15-year-old youth under conditions where economically disadvantaged youth are fully integrated with all others.
5. Use these funds to employ additional professional school counselors who, along with already existing counselors, could then meet the "counselor assurances" portions of YETP.
6. Fund joint training sessions of CETA and LEA persons at the local community level aimed at teaching both about general employability skills—and how to help persons acquire them.
7. Use these funds to collect sound evaluation data with respect to the effectiveness of LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements.
8. Allow LEAs to use these funds for purposes of validating their efforts under arrangements where their results can be shared with others on a Statewide diffusion network similar to the current National Diffusion Network.

CETA persons attending these miniconferences frequently expressed strong reservations about using any of this "1% linking money" at the local community level. Their reservations appeared to be based, not on questions of legality, but rather around their concerns that, if this is done, it would make one more categorical program that they would have to add to the 15 or more that they are already required to administer under various parts of CETA. Of all the things they didn't want, it was one *more* categorical program!

Joint Training of CETA and LEA Persons

Whether the "1% linking money" or some other source of funding is used, there appeared to be wide agreement that, if YETP is to be better integrated into the total LEA structure, one requirement that must be met is that joint training sessions, involving both CETA and LEA persons, be conducted. The primary content of this training, as participants envisioned it, was in the domain of general employability skills. Both CETA and LEA professionals have increasing need for expertise in this area. Both apply general employability skills to large numbers of others they serve—in addition to YETP youth. Several participants, in highlighting the importance of "general

employability skills" as a topic, emphasized that this topic is one of great interest and concern to both employers and to CBOs as well as to CETA and LEA persons. Possibilities of expanding this joint training to such groups was repeatedly emphasized.

In order to provide the kinds of training that will provide all such persons with appropriate skills and will, in addition, result in better linking YETP with the total LEA effort, a very innovative and comprehensive plan will be required. Participants in one miniconference "brainstormed" such a plan with the discussion spearheaded by John Fitzsimmons (CETA – Portland, Maine), by Frances Rosen (LEA – Sacramento, California), by Jim Hensley (LEA – Edinburg, Texas), and by Ana Maria Huerta (CETA – Endinburg, Texas). Other participants in this miniconference also contributed substantially to the "plan." The essential outline of their "plan" can be summarized as follows:

1. Build a statewide inventory of CETA/LEA/CBO/private sector/Employment Service persons who have special expertise in one or more segments of making a good LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement work. (e.g., the "lead time," "work site," "academic credit)."
2. Provide local communities with a list of these resource persons and a plan whereby they could invite as many as they need (with particular kinds of expertise) to discuss the broad problems of "employability skills" and "LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements."
3. Using CETA Governor's discretionary funds, provide training for these identified resource persons so that each can become, in effect, a "master trainer" of others. These "master trainers" will, themselves, be practitioners and will be released from their current assignment when called on by other communities to conduct training sessions (similar to the way California's "master trainer plan" works now in career education).
4. At each training site, identify specific components for delivery of employability skills that are not taking place. Come up with an integrated, coordinated community plan for delivering employability skills to youth and adults – both those served by CETA/YETP and by others.
5. Establish, as part of this "master trainer" arrangement, a plan whereby "master trainers" can be used to help evaluate the effectiveness of LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements now in effect in local communities. (The "master trainers" should be able to see both the "forest" *and* the "trees.")
6. Establish a plan for publicizing, on a Statewide basis, those LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements that have been "validated" by team visits conducted by "master trainers".

Use of this "master trainer" plan holds high potential, in the opinion of these participants, for: (a) providing both CETA and LEA persons with common knowledge regarding employability skills and ways in which such skills can be imparted to youth; (b) providing both CETA and LEA persons with a

23

common language so that they can understand each other better; (c) building trust, mutual confidence, and better personal relationships among CETA and LEA persons that will help each be more accepting of the other; (d) involving the broader community in a joint effort with both CETA and LEA persons so that maximum use is made of community resources; (e) providing a means of making "custom-made" LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements based on local conditions but having the input from knowledgeable experts; and (f) providing a validated series of LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements that can be used to illustrate ways in which YETP has been effectively integrated into the total LEA structure.

It is unlikely that the "brainstorming" effort reported here will be converted into effective action in many States. Because it is far from where most States are now in terms of CETA/LEA/community relationships does not mean that it is totally impractical and thus deserving of no serious consideration. On the contrary, it would seem that this "brainstorming" effort has produced the germ of an idea which could be converted into effective reality in many States.

Fitting YETP into Vocational Education

More of the LEA persons attending this series of miniconferences came from the field of vocational education than from any other single part of the Education system. In view of past relationships between vocational education and various manpower programs conducted under MDTA, it is not surprising to find that, in looking to LEAs for purposes of making LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements, many CETA Prime Sponsors felt it both easier and more appropriate to establish relationships with vocational educators than with other parts of the system.

Vocational educators participating in these miniconferences seemed to feel comfortable in relating to YETP and to YETP enrollees. Many saw little differences between what YETP was asking for and what vocational education already provides. They tended to see the "work experience" portions of YETP as essentially the same kinds of work experience currently being provided through vocational education. This is true in spite of the fact that, in terms of typical vocational education operations, there are some very significant differences. To most of the vocational educators in attendance, the prime differences they saw were related to the fact that YETP enrollees were: (a) paid for their work experience while many vocational education students were not; and (b) YETP enrollees tended to be placed in public sector employment for their work experience whereas "regular" vocational education students tended to have their work experience in private sector settings.

More than one of the vocational education persons in these miniconferences expressed a hope that, eventually, YETP efforts can become completely integrated with "regular" vocational education efforts. Several anticipated

that, given the expected limited life of YETP, this is what will eventually happen. For such integration to occur, they felt it would be necessary to create the following conditions: (a) more and better vocational education facilities being built and operated in urban inner-city environments where many of the YETP eligible youth live; (b) a much more concentrated campaign to interest YETP eligible youth in vocational education and attract them to the field of vocational education – i.e., they recognized that, by and large, their current students did not meet the "YETP eligible" guidelines; and (c) a system whereby YETP eligible youth, like other youth in vocational education, will not be paid for the work experience portion of vocational education – just as they are not paid for other portions.

Until such time as conditions described in the preceding paragraph are reached, most vocational education "types" in these miniconferences seemed to feel it necessary to, in effect, separate out YETP youth from other youth in vocational education. They felt especially strong about avoiding situations where some of the youth – namely, the YETP enrollees were being paid wages while other youth – namely, the "regular" vocational education students – are not paid wages.

One of the clearest ways in which vocational educators see themselves as useful in fitting YETP into the Education system is in the matter of gaining academic credit for work experience. Vocational educators have a long history of negotiating such things as: (a) the kind of supervision required; (b) the kinds of reports that are appropriate; and (c) the number of hours of work experience required to earn a full unit – or portion of a unit – of academic credit. They have also been successful, in many instances, in getting such work experience credit counted toward high school graduation. So long as they can defend the contention that the kind of work experience YETP enrollees receive is essentially the same as the kind "regular" vocational education students receive, it is relatively easy to justify pleas that academic credit be given for the work experience portion of YETP. This, perhaps as much as any other single factor, has caused many YETP programs to operate as though the YETP legislation called for absolutely no differences between these two kinds of work experience. The fact that obvious differences *are* spelled out in the YETP law has not prevented such practices from being rather commonplace apparently.

One justification given by vocational educators for this situation is that, while "ivory tower academaniacs" may speak comfortably about different "types" of work experience, there really *is* no essential difference to the typical work site supervisor. To such supervisors, "work experience" is work experience! They are undoubtedly correct in this perception in terms of many of today's work site supervisors. This topic will be dealt with in more detail in a later section of this monograph.

Vocational educators who were participants in this series of miniconferences also pointed to the "5% linking money" specifically earmarked for

CETA/Vocational Education linkages. The fact that much of this linkage money is expended for adult vocational education programs, rather than for typical secondary school vocational education, is not germane here. The point is, it represents a very concrete example of an effective way in which vocational education can better fit the total CETA effort into the total Education system – including the postsecondary portion of the Education system.

Certainly, vocational education can – and is – playing a vitally important role now in providing concrete educational opportunities for 14-15 YETP youth who have gone through YETP "transition services." St. Paul, Minnesota is a good example of an LEA whose vocational education program is tied directly to their three year YETP in-school program.

Because of their long prior history of involvement with various kinds of Department of Labor programs, many vocational educators are the major experts on topics such as "CETA" and "Prime Sponsors" within their LEAs. As the YETP effort seeks to be better integrated within the total fabric of the public school system, it is vocational educators in such system who, in many cases, can serve as the "interpreters" required to help CETA persons visit meaningfully with other persons in the LEA. Vocational educators can – and are – playing valuable roles in this effort.

Fitting YETP into Career Education

As stated in the beginning of this monograph, the original general purpose of this series of "miniconferences" was to explore and define relationships between YETP and career education. That purpose could not be kept as a singular one for two basic reasons: (a) many of the participants – especially those from CETA settings – knew nothing about career education; and (b) concerns of all participants extended to a broad variety of topics thus making it impossible to keep the focus of discussion on the "YETP/career education" theme. In spite of such limitations, there were four of the 15 miniconferences in which participants discussed the "YETP/career education" topic as a major discussion issue. A short summary of those discussions seems appropriate here.

Esther Korin (LEA – Rockland County, New York) observed that, as a career education specialist in her school district for the past five years, she is under an impression that she has been trying to do the same generic kinds of things that YETP now calls for – i.e., supplying youth with general employability/life survival skills and helping them in the process of career decision-making. She sees the career education movement in LEAs as a thread that will give some permanence in the Education system to the current YETP mission. Kay Hoff (CETA – State of Indiana) agreed with Esther and pointed out that, under what is now Title II-B of CETA, she has been trying, for five years, to provide persons with the general employability skills of career educa-

tion. Kay's feeling was one of regret that CETA persons had not been told much more about career education at a much earlier stage of things.

Mike Druley (LEA – Frankfort, Indiana) observed that there are still many, many LEAs where no bonafide career education effort yet exists, but where LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements are being made and implemented. In such communities, vocational education *does* typically exist and can be a much better source of linkage than a weak, or nonexistent career education effort. Gary Tuck (LEA – Portland, Oregon) emphasized that CETA "types" should not be asked to choose between "career education" and "vocational education" as linkage sources with LEAs. Instead, CETA has a right to expect that, within a given LEA, vocational education and career education will have found ways of "getting their acts together" so as to make the CETA/LEA linkage effort an even stronger and more effective one. This same feeling was expressed by several other participants.

Several participants raised the possibility that, since there are already Governor's discretionary funds already specifically earmarked for linking with vocational education, the new "1%" linkage money should be used relatively more for strengthening linkages between CETA and career education. Others pointed out that linkages with career education is but one of *five* basic purposes for which these "1%" funds could be used and it is unrealistic to expect that all – or even a majority – of those funds will be used strictly for CETA/career education linkages.

In one miniconference, participants suggested a CETA/career education linkage in the form of using adults trained under either Title II-B or Title VI of CETA to operate the various kinds of career resource centers being established as part of career education. If such persons could be utilized in this fashion, it would help greatly in making such centers more accessible to both youth and adults during evening hours as well as during the school day. Further, it was suggested that, eventually, such arrangements could lead to LEAs employing these persons using funds available under P.L. 95-207 – the "Career Education Incentive Act." Laddie Livingston (LEA – Delta, Colorado) is currently making some job slots for YETP youth in his career resource center that provides such youth employment in a setting that makes career education materials available to all students in the school system. This is a definite tie-in.

Several CETA persons in these miniconferences related that, when their LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement was negotiated, they were unaware of the career education concept – let alone that an active career education effort was underway in the LEAs with whom agreements were being made. Their entire LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement had been made with only vocational education in mind. It was obvious that, with very minor modifications, career education, too, could be used to help build better CETA/Education system linkages.

There were two major points where participants felt it obvious that a "YETP/career education" linkage would be helpful in attaining the legal mandate of YETP. One was when they recognized that the kinds of work experience called for under YETP – i.e., "*which will improve their ability to make career decisions and . . . provide them with basic work skills needed for regular employment*" – is a very clear way of describing the kind of "work experience" provided under career education. That is, "work experience" *whose primary purpose is career exploration and the acquisition of GENERAL employability skills.* It is very clear that this kind of work experience can be provided both to YETP eligible youth enrolled in vocational education and to YETP eligible youth who choose another high school curriculum. Without a linkage to career education, "work experience" under YETP runs two risks: (a) a risk of being limited to youth enrolled in vocational education; and (b) a risk of being undifferentiated from the typical vocational education work experience that is more highly oriented toward acquisition of specific vocational skills.

The second major point on which participants felt that a YETP/career education linkage should be made is in connection with those YETP requirements that jobs provided under YETP be relevant to the educational and career goals of participating youth. Such goals become relevant to youth only in the classrooms where they receive their educational program. Since a major portion of the career education effort is aimed at helping teachers – ALL teachers – show youth the career implications of their subject matter, it is obvious that this legal requirement of YETP can be better met if an active and positive "YETP/career education" linkage exists.

A final point on which most participants discussing this subject appeared to agree is that the career education effort – since it begins in the early elementary school years – can make powerful and positive contributions toward making economically disadvantaged youth "YETP ready" through beginning the effort to provide them with general employability skills – including the basic academic skills – considerably prior to the time they become YETP eligible – in terms of age.

Some participants – particularly those from LEA's – expressed concern that YETP and career education may be *too* closely related in terms of their basic goals and purposes. They seemed to feel that, if CETA Prime Sponsor personnel ever fully understand just how closely career education and YETP are related, they may not know how to deal with the situation. Others felt that, so long as career education persons in LEAs don't ask for large sums of YETP funds, such problems are unlikely to arise. On the opposite side of this question, Willie Horseley (LEA – Kansas City, Missouri) observed that, far from career education threatening YETP, the situation may well, in fact, be reversed. That is, there are far more YETP than career education funds from Federal sources available at the present time – and LEAs have a need to go where Federal funds can be made readily available.

Creating a Positive View of YETP Among Educators

In almost every miniconference in this series, the topic was raised of how to make the YETP effort appear more appealing to educators. In five of the 15, this became a major priority issue for discussion. Here, an attempt will be made to summarize views of conference participants under three broad headings: (a) sources of resistance to YETP on the part of educators; (b) essential understandings regarding YETP to be communicated to educators; and (c) methods and procedures for reaching educators with the "YETP message."

Sources of Educator Resistance to YETP

If educator resistance to YETP is a serious problem—and these practitioners certainly believe it *is*—then an essential first step to overcoming such resistance is to look carefully at its basic nature. Those studying this section should do so keeping clearly in mind that these sources of resistance do *not* apply to ALL educators by any means. On the contrary, the rapidity with which the YETP effort has been implemented in a wide variety of communities across the Nation stands as clear evidence that *most* educators are generally acceptive of YETP. That acceptance, however, is far from universal. Similarly, even in communities where YETP has been accepted—such as those represented in this series of miniconferences—those charged with implementing YETP have run into pockets of resistance among certain educators. It is in hopes of helping other communities become aware of such problems that this section is written.

There will be a natural temptation, on the part of some, to view the kinds of criticisms specified here as an overall indictment of the YETP effort. It is not intended to be used for that purpose. Rather, the reasons these criticisms are outlined here is that they *are* being voiced by educators in some communities. If one is to solve a problem, it is first necessary to clearly define it. It is a definition of the problem that represents the basic purpose of this section.

Negative Perception #1: YETP represents Federal funds—and Federal funds should be resisted. This perception, while in no way limited to educators, obviously does exist in some local communities—and, to a certain extent, at the State level as well. Persons holding this perception seem to have a general feeling that the "Feds" are trying to control them through "bribing" them, with Federal dollars, to do things which, if left to their own devices, they might or might not choose to do on their own. The need for or validity of the effort itself does not prevent this negative perception from being held by some persons. It is simply something to recognize that, for some persons, it does exist.

Negative Perception #2: YETP is a part of CETA—and CETA is a four letter word. Again, this is a negative perception found in many communities

not limited strictly to educators in those communities. Rather, it results from a rash of accounts in the media regarding various ways in which CETA funds have been misspent and, in some cases, actually used in an illegal manner. This negative perception led some participants to argue for trying to picture YETP to educators as an "educational" program rather than as a "CETA" program. Other persons strongly resisted this and proposed, instead, that it would be much better to embark on an active campaign to collect a series of CETA "success stories" and seek to have these publicized on National TV shows—just as some of the past negative stories have been publicized. There is no doubt but that the fact YETP is a part of CETA has caused some educators to resist accepting YETP into the Education system.

Negative Perception #3: CETA is in competition with the Education system. This perception was voiced several times by various participants. The feeling appears to be one of recognizing that many parts of CETA—including YETP—have educational components that require large numbers of Federal dollars. Those holding this negative perception seem to feel that, if all the Federal dollars now being spent on CETA educational efforts were, instead, made available to the formal Education system, the net result would be much more positive in terms of total societal benefits. The spector of a dual system of Education in the United States—one for the "haves" and the other for the "have nots"—has been in existence for many years. Those having such worries may well apply them to YETP—and so be resistive to the YETP effort.

Negative Perception #4: YETP is related to vocational education—and vocational education is second class education. This, too, was identified by several participants as a source of resistance to YETP by their local education systems. To the extent that YETP is pictured to educators as an extension of—or as simply a supplement to—current vocational education efforts, those educators holding negative perceptions of vocational education can be expected to transfer such negative perceptions to YETP as well. This is a problem which vocational education has been trying to solve for many years. In spite of the best that many of us have tried to do for a long time, the problem does still exist in terms of the attitudes of some nonvocational educators in the Education system. It is a problem that must be recognized by those concerned about implementing YETP efforts in schools.

Negative Perception #5: The proper current priority for American Education is "back to basics"—not preparing youth for work. Educators are accustomed to dealing with various "mandates of the moment" which, when they appear, have a tendency to downplay other basic goals of Education. The current "back to basics" movement is a good example. This problem, which YETP shares with career education, is one that can be solved only through helping persons recognize that both the YETP effort and the career education effort include components which, if properly applied, will motivate youth to learn the basic skills—and are thus properly seen as vehicles for use

in attaining the goals of the "back to basics" movement. There is much yet to do if this negative perception is to be overcome.

Negative Perception #6: Youth to be served under YETP are not the children of the "power people" in the community. All LEAs are dependent, to a considerable degree, on their local communities to provide them with operating funds. School boards, in many such local communities, are composed of persons in "power positions" in the community. Children of such persons are, by and large, those enrolled in the college preparatory programs of the school system. Most are, by no means, from poverty level families. While, to be sure, these kinds of conditions are changing thanks to changes in ways in which school board members are elected, this kind of condition does still exist in many communities. Where it exists, it may well create negative problems in terms of acceptance of YETP into the Education system.

Negative Perception #7: All YETP is trying to do is (a) put money in the pockets of youth, and (b) give youth "make-work" jobs. It is undoubtedly true that many persons hold a perception that YETP is, in effect, an "income transfer" effort aimed primarily at providing economically disadvantaged youth with money they would not otherwise have. This negative perception apparently has been re-enforced in the minds of some who have confused YETP with YIEP—another CETA youth program widely advertised as an experiment to see if providing youth with part-time jobs and money will keep them from dropping out of high school. Adverse publicity, especially with reference to the "play for pay" perceptions some have with regard to CETA's Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) have also apparently contributed to this negative perception.

Negative Perception #8: Youth shouldn't be paid money in order to encourage them to participate in any part of the school system's educational program. This perception seemed to be particularly strong among some persons in vocational education who objected strongly to YETP youth receiving money for work experience while "regular" students in vocational education do not typically get paid for their work experience parts of vocational education. This, perhaps as much as any other single factor, has made for problems in some communities with respect to the question of awarding YETP youth academic credit for their participation in YETP. The position being taken is that, if the activity is part of the regular educational program—and so deserving of academic credit—it should not be paid. If youth are paid for their work experience, then, by definition, it is *not* part of the educational program and so should not deserve academic credit.

Negative Perception #9: YETP youth are competing with youth enrolled in the Distributive Education (DE) program of vocational education for the same work sites. This perception, like the previous one, was voiced by some vocational educators in this series of miniconferences. They felt that, to the extent this is true, some youth will—because of the pay associated with work

experience in YETP—be tempted to drop out of "regular" vocational education and enroll in YETP programs. They further felt that work sites for DE students are tough to find under the best of circumstances and that YETP has made the situation even worse.

Negative Perception #10: Educators can't include YETP in their regular planning because they cannot obtain long term commitments from CETA Prime Sponsor personnel. This perception was one of the most frequently heard. Many school districts, if they are to provide academic credit to YETP youth, must employ certificated teachers. To employ certificated teachers, especially in school systems with strong teacher unions, demands that such teachers be on "hard money." The school system who hires teachers for purposes of working with YETP youth must retain such teachers on their payrolls whether or not the YETP funds come through. Yet, they are often faced with situations where they do not know, for sure, regarding the availability of YETP funds until a month or more after the school year has commenced. Even worse, some have experienced situations where, at the last moment, YETP funds which had been promised failed to materialize for one reason or another. All of these factors have made it most difficult for many school districts to include a YETP effort in their regular long range planning efforts. If YETP is not included in such efforts, it is hard to fit it in on a sudden emergency basis.

Negative Perception #11: CETA is a very complicated piece of legislation that leaves educators uncertain regarding exactly what they have agreed to do. This perception, too, was one commonly heard. Several participants reported that they did not understand all the requirements involved when they signed their LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement for YETP. Others, while apparently understanding that agreement, failed to understand how YETP fits in with the total CETA system and some of the general rules and regulations of CETA that educators must live with if they are to participate in YETP. The result is that some educators are finding themselves discovering certain requirements several months after they have begun a YETP effort. Moreover, they have experienced difficulty finding local CETA Prime Sponsor personnel who can adequately explain the CETA law and its regulations to them in easily understandable terms. This has created some doubt, suspicion, and distrust.

In closing this section, it is once again important to remind the reader that the negative perceptions reported here are *not* ones held by most educators. Neither is there any intent here to imply or to lend credence to those who apparently believe they are justified. They have been stated here simply because they *do* exist in many communities. In the communities represented in this series of miniconferences, these were the most common negative perceptions that those charged with implementing YETP efforts found it necessary to face—and to overcome. The strong and viable YETP efforts found in these

communities stands as a clear demonstration of the fact that such negative perceptions can be dealt with in a positive manner.

Communicating Positively with Educators about YETP

Faced with the kinds of negative perceptions outlined in the preceding section, how have LEA and CETA persons in local communities sought to have YETP, in particular, and CETA in general be viewed in a more positive light by educators? Each of the following arguments was reported by participants to have been successful in one or more of the communities involved in this series of miniconferences.

Positive Argument #1: YETP is a career exploration effort—not just another work-study program. Florence Brady (LEA—Westmont, New Jersey) was one of the participants who reported this argument is effective with those educators who have typically been disdainful of regular work study programs. When Florence could show them that YETP youth are engaged in a wide variety of kinds of activities aimed at enhancing their knowledge of themselves and of the occupational society, YETP came to be viewed in a more positive light. It was particularly helpful to picture YETP as a way of expanding career options for youth, as opposed to further limiting such options.

Positive Argument #2: YETP should be considered simply as an extension of the regular school program—not as just another "CETA program" to be added to the regular school program. This point was made both by Don Parsons (LEA—Flagstaff, Arizona) and by Florence Brady. They felt that YETP *can*—and should—be pictured to educators as consisting of three basic components: (a) career awareness/career exploration; (b) career counseling; and (c) basic skill development for general employability skills. Their point is that educators are already committed to these three goals and that, when YETP is pictured in these terms, educators can see YETP as a means of helping the Education system do what educators are already trying to do. If YETP is added, the total Education system increases in effectiveness.

Positive Argument #3: YETP can provide resources that will enhance both the image and the effectiveness of cooperative education persons and of counselors in the Education system. This argument has apparently been successfully used in those situations where cooperative education teachers and counselors are asked, by CETA Prime Sponsor persons, to state their goals and objectives. When this is done, it is relatively easy to demonstrate how a YETP effort can make positive contributions toward the attainment of such goals. Moreover, this can be done in ways that bring added credit both to cooperative education teachers and to school counselors.

Positive Argument #4: YETP operates as a positive, developmental effort, not as a remedial effort like some other parts of CETA. This is an argument some participants reported to be effective in overcoming objections some

educators have to CETA in general. They report this argument to be successful when they can show that, in effect, YETP is aimed to help youth while they are still in school—and so to contribute to reducing the incidence of school dropouts. If the YETP effort is successful within school districts, there may eventually be less of a need for large CETA efforts to reach out-of-school youth. Combining the resources of the education system with those of CETA may well prove to be more cost effective than operating the Education system and the CETA effort as two completely independent movements. This is an argument that can be made in a very effective manner.

Positive Argument #5: YETP may well, in the long run, reduce adult unemployment in the United States. This is another argument being used to counteract those who tend to complain about the whole CETA system. It is usually made by pointing out to educators that adult unemployment is, to some extent at least, related to failure of our educational system to adequately prepare youth for work and/or to motivate them to want to work. If the Education system can be considered to be part of the *problem* of adult unemployment, it can certainly be used as part of the *solution*. Educators would do much better if they devote their efforts toward solutions than toward emphasizing the problem. Even though a wide variety of other factors are relatively more responsible for adult unemployment than is Education, it is hard to deny an argument that our Education system does have *some* responsibility here—and, so, *some* opportunity to make positive contributions toward solution of this problem.

Positive Argument #6: YETP is best pictured as an EMPLOYABILITY program, not as an EMPLOYMENT program. This argument is being used by those who have to react to criticism that YETP is simply creating "make work" jobs for youth. The argument is based on YETP requirements that the jobs they are given must be ones that: (a) improve their ability to make career decisions; (b) provide them with basic skills required to find unsubsidized employment; and (c) relate to their educational and career goals. The YETP work experience (jobs) effort is *not* designed simply either to provide youth with specific vocational skills required in a single occupation or to meet employer demands for productivity. Rather, the YETP work experience (jobs) program is one aimed specifically at enhancing the career development of YETP youth—and especially at providing each with a set of general employability skills that will be useful to them throughout their adult working life—no matter what specific occupations they may pursue. It should be noted here that not *all* participants in these miniconferences felt this to be a valid argument. However, those who are using it report it to be effective with some "objectors to YETP."

Positive Argument #7: Eventually YETP will disappear but the youth YETP seeks to serve will still be in the Education system and we must learn better how to meet their needs. This argument is apparently being effectively used in school districts having large number of youth who are economically

disadvantaged. Such school systems have only to look at their current dropout rates to recognize that the needs of such youth are not being well met at the present time. YETP can be pictured, not only as an immediate source of help to LEAs in meeting the needs of such youth, but also as a knowledge building effort that will enable school districts to discover ways of continuing to meet needs of such youth long after YETP has disappeared. Those using this argument report it can be made even more effective by showing educators that YETP itself has a very limited planned time in which it will exist. The economically disadvantaged youth will still be in our schools long after YETP is due to disappear from the scene. We should take advantage of this opportunity to learn more about how to serve these youth while we have a chance to do so.

Positive Argument #8: If it weren't for YETP, school taxes would be higher. Fred Kaufman (LEA – Plattsmouth, Nebraska) was one of the participants who reported this to be an effective argument. Fred is one of those LEA persons who used the term "CETA" in a general sense (rather than using such terms as "YETP") in explaining his school system's various forms of Federal revenues to his advisory boards. He had estimated that, were it not for his YETP program, he would have had to request at least a two mill increase in his school tax levy during the past year. The argument is that, given these dollars, we are able to operate out total educational program at an acceptable level of quality. Were the Federal dollars not here, we would either have to: (a) reduce the quality of our total program; or (b) increase our local school tax levy. This is an argument that can be especially effective with educators who realize that their salaries are directly affected by the total size of the school district's operating budget.

In closing this subsection, two important points must be made. First, not ALL of the communities represented in this series of miniconferences have apparently found it necessary to do any kind of "selling" job for YETP. The arguments summarized in this – and in the preceding – section are ones reported only by those participants who had experienced some difficulty in getting educators to accept YETP. Second, while each of the positive arguments reported here is in use in one or more communities, it would be erroneous to assume that ALL persons responsible for running YETP operations would even agree with these arguments – let alone use them. At the same time, it can be reported here that, when the topic of how to convince educators of the worth of YETP was raised, we have reported here all of the positive arguments suggested by participants for answering those arguments.

Methods and Procedures for Reaching Educators with the "YETP Message"

No arguments for picturing YETP positively to educators can be effective unless opportunities for presenting such arguments are made available. As a

final sub-part of this section, an attempt will be made here to summarize the major methods and procedures participants reported using in getting the "YETP message" across to educators.

Method 1: Involve school counselors in identifying YETP eligible youth in the school district. This approach was reported as especially effective when it involved paying school counselors, during the Summer months, to participate in the identification process. School counselors have access to many kinds of school records, not all of which can be shared with CETA personnel since they may come from confidential files. At the same time, school counselors are in a position to make some professional judgments helpful in determining special aspects of YETP eligibility for certain youth. In addition, by involving school counselors in this process, a series of excellent opportunities are made available to communicate to them the basic rationale behind and purposes of the total YETP effort—including the ongoing responsibilities of professional school counselors in that effort. If school counselors become convinced that CETA Prime Sponsor personnel are sincere in their efforts to assist YETP youth in the career development process, it can help greatly in getting increased acceptance for YETP among other educators in the school system.

Method 2: Insofar as possible, seek to have YETP implemented in accordance with the standard implementation process of the school district. Those proposing this procedure emphasized that such a process typically includes a series of hearings, among various groups, explaining the program and answering questions about it. The process also typically includes a presentation to and formal action of the Board of Education in the school district. To follow such a process provides multiple opportunities to present the YETP "story" to both decisionmakers and to key operational persons within the school district. Further, following this procedure is a positive approach to getting YETP accepted as a bonafide part of the total school district program. When school district decisions regarding YETP have to be made—because of fiscal year and/or time constraints—on an emergency ad hoc basis, it is much more difficult to create conditions where educators both understand and accept YETP.

Method 3: Use State Department of Education (SEA) officials to communicate the "YETP message" to educators in local school districts. In Arizona, for example, Joe Baird (CETA—State program) reported that his staff holds periodic meetings with LEA field staff persons to orient them with respect to YETP's basic nature and mission. The SEA staff, who work closely with CETA prime sponsors, are picking up a lot of information regarding both CETA in general and YETP in particular, but they haven't yet been able to communicate all of this to LEAs as yet. Other SEAs who reported very effective efforts now operating to acquaint LEA persons with YETP included both Rhode Island (Janet Carroll—SEA), California (Tom Jacobson—LEA, La Mesa) and Mississippi (Wilma Jackson—CETA). There are undoubtedly others.

In one miniconference, considerable discussion was aimed at describing some of the *negative* experiences found when attempts were made to use SEA staff to get the YETP message across to LEAs. Among the negative things that, apparently, have occurred are the following: (a) In some States, LEAs report knowing much more about CETA than does anyone they can find in their SEA; (b) One participant reported a situation where LEAs had received letters from someone in the SEA warning them that, if they accept YETP funds, they run the risk of losing all other Federal education funding; and (c) some SEAs have apparently discouraged vocational educators at the LEA level whose salaries are paid entirely out of the "6% money" from Title II-B of CETA to participate, in any way, in Title IV CETA programs; In spite of such occurrences, the general principle of seeking to use SEA professional staff persons as a resource for explaining YETP to LEA persons is a sound one.

Method 4: Use LEA Career Education Coordinators to explain YETP to other educators and gain acceptance for YETP. Several participants reported themselves using this approach. The advantages they saw in doing so were based primarily around the fact that career education and YETP share many of the same basic purposes and goals. Thus, when the LEA career education coordinator is "selling" YETP, she/he is also, in effect, "selling" career education for that portion of the total school population eligible for YETP participation. Moreover, since the career education effort is intended to reach ALL students, there is a good opportunity to point out that the same kinds of *general* opportunities being provided to economically disadvantaged youth under YETP are being provided to all other youth under career education. A very strong point in favor of this method was seen in the fact that the career education coordinator has routine relationships with academic teachers, as well as with vocational education teachers, and may be able to effectively reach some academic teachers who are personally opposed to vocational education.

Method 5: Make graphic charts for both the CETA operation and the vocational education programs and present these to educators. Those suggesting this approach pointed out that, if organizational charts are used, many natural "partnerships" can be found to exist between LEA and CETA Prime Sponsor staff persons. Moreover, clear lines of communication can be established between vocational educators and CETA personnel. Use of such charts with other educators can help re-enforce the basic concept that YETP is a valuable supplement to an already established educational program and is, in no way, an "add-on" mechanism that the LEA is being asked to accept. While this approach has obvious value, it is equally obvious that it must be supplemented by other approaches if ALL educators are to be convinced of the worth of YETP. It is not enough to "sell" only the vocational educators in the LEA.

Method 6: Use CETA Prime Sponsor personnel as resource persons to help LEA persons write grant proposals to the U.S. Department of Labor. This is

another easy and natural way of helping LEA persons better understand the workings of the entire CETA system. Several CETA persons participating in these miniconferences reported their LEAs interested in writing proposals to YOUTH WORK—a quasi-governmental organization funded with DOL funds. In the process of providing such help, they were able to help those LEA persons understand the entire CETA system. Moreover, they established friendly professional working relationships with LEA persons which have been—and continue to be—useful in implementing YETP efforts in LEAs.

Method 7: Use YETP youth participants in public relations efforts on behalf of YETP. Several participants suggested some variation of this general approach. One, for example, reported assigning some YETP enrollees to work experience slots that consisted of searching for and writing up local CETA "success stories" for publication in local newspapers. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Terry Mehail reported that some YETP youth, with career interests in the field of the performing arts, are putting on plays for elementary school pupils aimed at increasing their career awareness. Another participant suggested that almost any LEA could select YETP enrollees who are having some good career exploration experiences through their YETP jobs and arrange for those youth to speak to local civic clubs. (Note: some other participants disagreed with this idea. Their fear was that it might create an image that YETP is trying to publicize *only* its "successes.") In general, participants appeared to be in high agreement that YETP youth themselves are a valuable resource for use in helping educators, as well as others in the community, better understand and accept YETP as a worthy effort.

Method 8: Conduct joint training sessions for CETA and LEA personnel around the general topic of employability skills. This approach, discussed in some detail earlier in this monograph, does not require elaboration here. However, any list of possible methods for use in helping educators better understand YETP certainly must include this approach as one well worth considering.

Summary of Discussion

In this section, the topic of creating a positive view of YETP among educators has been discussed from three perspectives. It is obvious that several negative perceptions exist, at the present time, in the minds of educators and others regarding CETA in general and YETP in particular. It is equally obvious that, as CETA and LEA persons have encountered such objections, they have been able to mount a number of kinds of effective arguments in favor of YETP. Moreover, they have devised and are using a variety of approaches in getting this more positive message across to educators and to the general public. There is a long way to go, but we *have* begun.

Involving the Broader Community in the YETP Effort

In seven of the 15 miniconferences in this series, participants picked the general topic of making YETP a broader community effort—i.e., as an effort involving more than simply Prime Sponsor personnel working with LEA persons. This topic, when it was raised, typically provoked more heated discussion than almost any other single topic identified by participants as a priority issue. The discussion of this general topic, unlike many other topics, reflected both a sense of urgency for the importance of the topic and a sense of general vagueness with respect to its specific dimensions and implications. An attempt will be made here to convey to readers both of these feelings as expressed by the participants.

Part of the problem with this issue became apparent early in this series of conferences. In our desire to link CETA persons with LEA persons, we had failed to include, as conference participants, representatives from community based organizations (CBOs). It was obvious that many CETA persons were uncomfortable with this. Similarly, several of the LEAs expressed feelings of uneasiness in that the prime topic was limited to YETP rather than to the complete range of their efforts to deal with problems of work/education relationships facing youth. Both of these factors seemed to contribute to the frequency with which this general problem was raised as a priority discussion item—and to the general sense of uneasiness in discussing it.

Here, the total discussion of this general topic will be summarized using, as section headings, the major subtopics that emerged from the combined set of discussions.

Why Should YETP be Viewed as a Broad Community Effort—or Should It?

Those in favor of making YETP a broad community effort outnumbered, by a considerable margin, those opposed to doing so. However, those who saw disadvantages in pursuing such goals were insistent that their point of view be heard. Consequently, an attempt will be made here to present both sides of this argument.

Those arguing in favor of making YETP a broad community effort used the following basic arguments with respect to why this is needed:

1. The need for providing youth with general employability skills—and so the need for both YETP and career education—are certain to increase in the years ahead. If we can enlist broad community support in our attempts to deliver general employability skills to youth, both YETP and career education will look better. If they produce better results, each will have an increased probability of becoming an institutionalized, sustaining effort.

2. The CETA Prime Sponsor's role emphasizes the importance of functioning as a "community coordinating agency." Thus, CETA has the need to move toward broad community involvement as an inherent part of its basic charter.
3. YETP youth have spent the first 15 years of their lives developing negative attitudes and lack of hope for the future. To turn this situation around and help these youth become productive workers in our society is going to take a broad community effort. Neither CETA Prime Sponsors nor LEAs can meet the needs of these youth by themselves – nor even if they simply join forces with each other. The broader community must become involved.
4. YETP youth have many problems – e.g., health problems, clothing problems, personal hygiene problems, etc. – that extend beyond, but are related to, the problems they face in career development. A variety of community agencies are well equipped to help YETP youth solve some of these problems. They have both more expertise and more resources for doing so than do either CETA persons of LEA persons. If we are concerned about total development of the YETP youth, we must include such community agencies in our efforts.
5. CBOs typically understand YETP youth better than LEAs do whereas LEAs typically know more about both education and about career development than do CBOs. If both are concerned abouth the *youth*, they will find ways of combining their talents so that each youth can receive maximally effective help.
6. Involving the broader community in the YETP effort is a positive means of overcoming community criticism of both CETA and of the LEAs. We can turn some of our critics into supporters.
7. If we will involve a broad variety of community agencies in helping meet certain needs of YETP youth – especially health related needs – we can save more of the YETP funds for use in subsidizing work experience slots for YETP youth.

Those expressing reservations about launching a large effort to make YETP a broad community effort were not, by and large, objecting to the concept of seeking as much help for youth as possible. Rather they were bringing up a number of practical constraints which, in their background of experience, led them to believe that this is an effort which should be approached cautiously and slowly, if at all. Among their expressed concerns were the following:

1. Large urban areas consist, in effect, of "cities of neighborhoods" with organizations in each "neighborhood" having its own particular brand of expertise. Each also has its own "language" and its own perspective with respect to what needs to be priority action items. Most importantly, each CBO, in each "neighborhood," has its own "turf" to protect and a sense of responsibility not to stray far from priorities of its counterparts in other "neighborhoods." This makes YETP, as a community effort, an

impractical idea. Just because we see YETP as a high priority item doesn't mean that others will.

2. In some communities, LEAs get "negative brownie points" if they work with the kinds of CBOs on the list of a typical CETA Prime Sponsor. Conversely, some of the community organizations with whom LEAs typically work most closely are classical "enemies" of CETA Prime Sponsors. Given these two facts—and the current problems we're having in simply getting CETA persons together with LEA persons, we would do better not trying to expand our efforts further.
3. Very few persons employed in either an LEA or in a CETA setting has the term "cooperation" built into his/her job description. Moreover, very few are either promoted or fired depending on the extent to which they attempt to work with various elements in the broader community. Thus, from a practical standpoint, the *incentive* for a collaborative effort is hardly ever in place. We do better when we concentrate our efforts on those things for which we are being rated and evaluated.
4. Time constraints placed on both CETA persons and on LEA persons make it impractical to think that we will be able to mount a very large community collaborative effort. There are too many things that both CETA persons and LEA persons must do to "survive" on a day-to-day basis. If we can't engage in a large collaborative effort, it might be wiser not to begin one at all.

In view of the generally positive fashion most persons today seem to be talking about community collaborative efforts, it is possible that the above list of reasons for *not* making YETP a broad community effort may represent a newer view of the topic than the positive list that preceded it. Because something is "newer" does not, of course, mean it is more right. It is important, at the outset, to recognize that substantial differences in points of view existed among participants here. Such differences will become even more obvious in the subsection that follows.

Concepts Important to Consider in YETP Community Efforts

As discussion of this topic took place, there were a few broad concepts on which general agreement seemed to be present. One was that such an effort should *not* try to encompass the entire community. Rather, it should be restricted to community agencies and organizations who have priority concerns for: (a) youth; (b) employment; and/or youth/work relationships. The point is that "membership" in the kind of community "partnership" being envisioned should be determined, first of all, on the expertise the community agency/organization brings to one or more of these three basic problems. A second general agreement was found on the general concept that a community collaborative effort must become, in effect, two basic kinds of efforts—one consisting of collections of the "power" persons in each agency/

organization and the second consisting of the "go-fers"—i.e., the people who actually carry out daily tasks—in each agency/organization. Finally, general agreement was found on the concept that it is two quite different things to talk about (a) a good "relationship" existing among two or more community agencies or organizations, as opposed to (b) concrete ways in which two or more agencies/organizations work together to deliver needed help to a particular YETP youth. On these points, general agreement seemed clear on the part of those participants favoring some kind of community collaborative effort.

The basic disagreement centered around whether (a) the CETA Prime Sponsor; or (b) the LEA should be the central force in bringing the community collaborative effort into being. Participants who were CETA persons were in high agreement that this should be—and is—a basic responsibility of the CETA Prime Sponsor. They emphasized the fact that the CETA Manpower Planning Council *is* responsible for *employment* problems in the community and, no matter how else YETP may be viewed, its "bottom line" will eventually wind up being employment in the public and/or private sector. They further argued that the task of building community collaborative efforts is a part of the legal responsibilities of the CETA Prime Sponsor. Finally, they argued that, since the bedrock word is "work" and the CETA Prime Sponsor staff knows more about "work" than any other part of the community, it is both natural and logical that the CETA Prime Sponsor staff should take a leadership role in making YETP a community collaborative effort.

LEA persons in this series of miniconferences were almost unanimous in taking a different point of view. They reasoned that a large variety of community agencies are concerned about and involved in various aspects of the youth education/work dilemma that currently exists. The CETA Prime Sponsor is only one such agency. The LEA, on the other hand, is the only community segment that theoretically houses ALL the youth. This, in itself, makes it logical that the LEA should head up the YETP community collaborative effort. Moreover, LEA persons argued that it is the LEA, not the CETA Prime Sponsor, that enjoys wide community respect. They felt that, if the LEA were to call a meeting of diverse community groups, almost all would attend at least an initial meeting. On the other hand, were such a meeting to be called by a CETA Prime Sponsor, many community organizations/agencies would ignore the call.

In short, the CETA persons saw the LEAs as being but one among many CBOs with whom they are working on the total employment/unemployment problem. The LEAs, in turn, saw the CETA Prime Sponsor operations as only one among a number of community agencies trying to reach in-school youth on some aspect of the education/work relationship domain. Further, they saw the CETA Prime Sponsor's efforts as reaching only a portion of the total student population and could not see, with this restriction, how the CETA Prime

Sponsor office could possibly serve as the coordinating agent for a YETP community collaborative effort.

Two different attempts were made, by some participants, to resolve this seemingly irreconcilable gap in perceptions between CETA persons and LEA persons. One was an attempt to conceptualize the community effort as one where "Youth" was designated as the core – rather than either the CETA Prime Sponsor or the LEA. It was reasoned that, if our central focus can be kept on the needs of youth, it is possible, in any given community, for any one of a large variety of community agencies to take the lead role – not necessarily either the CETA Prime Sponsor or the LEA. For example, Jama Roman (LEA – Toledo, Ohio) pointed out that, in her community, the Junior League is currently taking a community lead role around the general topic of "child advocacy" and trying to interest all kinds of community organizations interested in children and youth to join forces in a total community effort. It is possible, in Jama's opinion, that the "child advocacy" movement may become as big, during the decade of the 1980s as was the "women's movement" during the decade of the 1970s or the "civil rights movement" during the decade of the 1960s.

The second attempt to reconcile differences came in the form of a proposal to put "work experience" as the central core and position all community agencies/organizations interested and active in some phase of work experience in various positions around that core. This was seen as a *substantive* topic of obvious interest to both LEAs and to CETA Prime Sponsors as well as to a variety of other kinds of agencies and organizations in both the public and private sectors.

In no miniconference where this debate occurred was it fully resolved to the satisfaction of all participants. Instead, the typical miniconference chose, instead, to provide examples of ways in which they are now engaged in community collaborative efforts. We turn now to a presentation of some such examples.

YETP Community Collaborative Efforts: Examples of Practice

Some of the examples to be presented here are ones initiated through efforts of CETA Prime Sponsor persons. Others are outgrowths of LEA efforts. It is hoped that some from both sources will be seen as having value. These two basic kinds of examples have been intermingled in the following list to avoid the danger of further emphasizing the philosophical differences noted in the preceding subsection.

Example 1: Publish a "YETP newsletter" and distribute it to a wide variety of community agencies and organizations. In some communities (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania is a good example) such a newsletter is being thought of as a "YEDPA Newsletter" that covers all youth programs under Title IV of CETA.

In other communities (Springfield, Ohio for example) it is published as a YETP newsletter and widely distributed to various community agencies known or thought to be interested in the problem. The two major advantages of this approach are: (a) it is an easy way to give "credit" to community organizations who are involved (thus encouraging others to become more active) and (b) it is good community public relations in that it affords multiple opportunities to get YETP "success stories" out to a good many influential community persons.

Example 2: House counselors from several CBOs in a single center from which a total YETP operation—both in-school and out-of-school—is run. Bettye Tumlinson (LEA) and John Carney (CETA) from Wichita, Kansas provided a good illustration with their "YES" Center. "YES" stands for "Youth Employment Service" and serves 16-21-year-old youth, *most* (but not all) of whom are out of school youth. Primarily concerned with providing transition services, YES is staffed by counselors from a variety of CBOs—e.g., SER, Urban League, Mid-America Indian Center, State ES, LEA, etc.) each of which has been asked to provide one counselor for the YES center. This arrangement has allowed counselors from various agencies to learn more about all other community agencies and to make the concept of a total community effort come to life. It is far from perfect—primarily because counselors are so busy they don't have enough time to interact with each other—but it is certainly a good beginning.

Example 3: Consider getting away from the practice of funding CBOs to do completely different things. Instead, base funding for each, in part, on its demonstrated ability to cooperate with others. This general idea was raised by Tim Reagan (CETA—Boston) and seemed to find good receptivity among other participants in the miniconference he attended. The point being made was that, if community collaboration is to occur, there must be some "rewards" built in for doing so—and some "lack of rewards" built in for ignoring the plea for community collaboration. Tim's observation was that, to the extent separate and independent contracts are made with a variety of CBOs—each completely discrete from all others—it is unlikely that much progress toward community collaboration can be made.

Example 4: Build collaboration around mutual societal goals, not on specific individual program goals. A good example of this idea in practice can be seen in the "CETA Multi-Service Center" operating in Memphis, Tennessee. With several CBOs housed in this single Center, a concentrated effort is being made to develop a "We—CETA" attitude rather than a "Me—OIC," "Me—Ser," etc., diverse set of attitudes. To do this, Sherm Olson (CETA—Memphis) reports that an emphasis on broad societal problems such as "poverty," "youth unemployment," and "economically disadvantaged" have allowed persons from various CBOs to see that they share some common interests and concerns. Moreover, it has helped them discover

ways in which they can combine forces to meet the needs of the "multi-eligible" client.

Example 5: Use CBOs to help locate out-of-school youth for this portion of YETP—and, by doing so, interest them in becoming involved in YETP out-of-school programs. This is a practice currently being followed by Ed Andrews (CETA—Providence, Rhode Island). It has a very practical base; namely, that, once a youth has dropped out of high school, the LEA typically has no good idea how to find her/him. CBOs, on the other hand, are located in neighborhood where such youth are living and can identify them rather easily. Moreover, because of the personal relationships they have developed through their counseling of such youth (it was pointed out that it is sometimes more important for a youth that his counselor speaks Spanish than that she possesses a Master's degree in Counseling!) such CBOs can be very helpful in interesting some of these youth in participating in the out-of-school YETP program. Obviously, under such arrangements, the CBO must be expected to be paid something for its efforts.

Example 6: Fund CBOs to actually conduct the employment experiences portion of YETP for out-of-school youth. This is a practice being followed, for example, in Savannah, Georgia. The basic point here is the same as previously made; namely, CBOs can—and will—become involved in YETP community collaborative efforts if they are paid to do so. They will not do so for strictly altruistic reasons, not because they wouldn't like to, but rather because their financial resources prevents them from doing so.

Example 7: Establish a Community Resource Center in an empty school building and invite a variety of kinds of community agencies to use its facilities. John Sedey (LEA—St. Paul, Minnesota) reported that, by establishing such Centers in various empty elementary schools, they were able to make career services available to both youth and adults on almost a "neighborhood" basis. John pointed to one of the most common dangers facing those who embark on community collaborative efforts when he observed that, when service centers are established ostensibly for purposes of referring persons to a variety of other kinds of community service centers, there is a temptation for the "referral center" itself to start providing direct services to clients. To the extent this is allowed to happen, its ability to refer persons to others is impaired—as well as its relationships with such other agencies.

Example 8: Consciously recruit a variety of kinds of community agencies to participate in a YETP community effort. An example of where this obviously straightforward approach has been taken can be seen in the Hacienda LaPuente Union School District in California. There, Bob Bassard (LEA) reports that he has been successful in recruiting (a) churches; (b) state rehabilitation services; (c) United Way; (d) local service clubs; (e) county health programs; and (f) the school nurse program to link together in providing a variety of kinds of support services to YETP youth in that school district. This has *not* been a financial cost to the school district.

Example 9: Host a series of "Community YETP Workshops," one for each of several community organizations, using a "miniconference" format. While this idea could not be found in actual use, it was suggested by Jorja Jacobs (LEA – Tulsa, Oklahoma) and well received by others. Jorja's point was that, if we can get influential community organization leadership to take the time to understand YETP, chances are good that we can get them involved as "partners" with us. She felt that the informal structure of the "miniconference" she was attending was one she could use to accomplish this objective. She suggested that, by doing this at night, the actual cost would be very minimal indeed.

Example 10: Use members of the Governor's Advisory Council on CETA to host community meetings to explain YETP. Jim Calder (CETA – Nevada) indicated that hosting such community meetings is one of the things members of this Council frequently do. If the LEA would join in co-sponsoring such a meeting, it is possible that some of the "hard to reach" business persons would be more likely to attend. Moreover, if such persons could see, at such a meeting, LEA and CETA persons on the same "team," it might create more favorable attitudes toward CETA.

Example 11: Hold a "State Youth Conference" sponsored by the Prime Sponsor(s) of the State. An example of this approach to community collaboration was reported by Bob Griffith (SEA – West Virginia) which sounded good. The Prime Sponsor invited all CETA program operators, all county superintendents, and all CBOs in the State of West Virginia to attend the conference. At the conference itself, workshops on CETA were held – including ones on proposal writing. It was apparently a very good exchange opportunity and resulted in several participants, from various societal segments, getting to know each other better.

While none of the examples presented in this section could be said to represent the ideal community collaborative effort that many participants talked about in philosophical terms, they do illustrate that beginnings have been made – and that some concrete progress toward community collaboration has taken place.

Involving the Private Sector in YETP Efforts

Great interest was expressed by many participants for finding ways of getting greater involvement of YETP youth in private sector settings. This basic interest was well expressed by Dave Wasson (LEA – Kingman, Arizona) who observed that, so long as his YETP work experience slots are limited to Public Service Employment (PSE), he has difficulties helping youth understand that: (a) "profit" is a good word; and (b) something more than "service" is required for the American economy to keep operating. Other possible advantages accruing to youth, if they can be placed in private sector slots, include: (a) this is where most of the "meaningful" work is located – not in PSE slots; (b)

when YETP youth are placed in PSE slots, they observe, in many instances, bad work habits rather than good work habits—thus destroying some of the basic things YETP seeks to teach them; (c) if private sector employers can become constructively involved in YETP, they may well develop a more positive image—and so a greater degree of support—for the YETP program; and (d) we hope, eventually, that YETP youth will, for the most part, find employment in the private sector—and it will obviously be easier for them to do so if they have their YETP work experience in the private sector. These seemed to be the major motivations for wanting private sector involvement. At least, they were the ones most often stated by these participants.

Other participants were quick to point out the many kinds of obstacles currently existing with respect to private sector slots for YETP youth. Some of the constraints mentioned most frequently included: (1) CETA regulations prohibit youth from engaging in "productive work" in the private sector—and little can be learned strictly through observation; (2) collective bargaining sign offs must be obtained from organized labor if YETP youth are to obtain work experience in private sector settings; (3) it is difficult to interest or motivate employers to take YETP youth on—i.e., they have many others seeking to work for them and they tend to regard these youth as poor risks; (4) private sector employers expect youth who come to them for work experience to have *some* specific vocational skills that will make them productive for the employer—and many YETP youth have not yet acquired such skills; (5) restrictions associated with the rules and regulations of the VEPS program are so tight it is almost impossible to place youth in the private sector and meet all of these restrictions in a strictly legal manner; and (6) a variety of existing child labor laws make it extremely difficult to place youth in private sector settings for their work experience.

Joan Podraza (CETA—Nebraska) described how she uses the Youth OJT (YOJT) component of YETP for 11th and 12th grade YETP youth under arrangements where the private sector employer is reimbursed half the wages of the YETP youth for up to 1140 hours. Youth are paid depending on the prevailing apprentice wage. They also use the tax break incentive employer provisions which, when combined with the fact that CETA pays half the youth's salary, makes a most attractive package for the private sector employer. During the regular school year, youth enrolled in this program can work 20 hours per week and, during the Summer, they can work 40 hours per week. Participants from other communities indicated that, due to the way in which CETA rules and regulations are interpreted in their communities, they simply could not do this.

Joan further described her program with two operational examples. One involved a youth who worked for a local radio station. He started out learning about the station, doing odd jobs, and then began writing up ads for the station. He advanced from there to reading ads on the radio and finally wound up with his own disc jocky show. He's now at the University of Nebraska ma-

joring in Communications Broadcasting. A second youth wanted to be an auto mechanic. The owner of a small auto/body repair shop (in a community of 150 persons) has agreed to train this youth, as an 11th grader, for 20 hours per week during the school year and 40 hours per week during the Summer. The youth is paid a training allowance and is receiving academic credit.

The recently enacted tax credit incentive plan has, apparently, still not been well understood by several of these participants. They had heard of it, but never used it. Others (Tom Theilman – CETA, New York State) has completed all paper work necessary to participate. Tom uses this program, not as a regular part of YETP, but, rather, as an *extension* of YETP – i.e., as an initial entry into full-time employment after the youth has left YETP. Cynthia Conwell (EDCO – Boston, Massachusetts) suggested that this same pattern *could* be followed for YETP youth if, for any one given job, we were to divide it up between two YETP youth. She had not yet been able to carry this through for YETP youth, but had done so for some YIEP enrollees.

In general, it seemed apparent that there was a strong desire among participants for getting much more private sector involvement in the YETP program. At the same time, they found themselves restricted – and sometimes confused – by what appear to be a great many CETA rules and regulations that make it difficult for this to be accomplished. They would welcome conditions where YETP could view private sector work experience as a "post graduate course" kind of experience for YETP youth who have already been exposed to some work experience in PSE settings. They would like it still better if there were ways of placing YETP youth directly into private sector work experience settings from the beginning. They do not think this will be easy – and, in some communities, it will apparently remain virtually impossible – until and unless the CETA law and its rules and regulations are changed.

Work Sites and Work Site Supervisors in YETP

Special priority was placed on the topic of "work sites and work site supervision" by participants in three of the miniconferences. Discussion became especially heated due, in large part, to apparent variations that existed among the various communities represented in this series of miniconferences. The major sources of variations included: (a) whether the work site supervisor is an in-school YETP supervisor *or* a supervisor from either the public or the private sector ("in-school" supervisors were seen as better at providing youth with general employability skills whereas PSE/Private Sector supervisors were seen as better in providing youth with specific vocational skills); (b) whether the work site supervisor is a paid or nonpaid person; (c) whether the work site was in the private sector or in the public service sector; (d) whether the work site supervisors were all required to be certificated vocational education

teachers or whether "regular" workers are used as work site supervisors; and (e) whether the work site supervisor is a professional person or a nonprofessional person – i.e., it's different if the supervisor is a teacher than if she/he is a maintenance employee.

In spite of these obvious differences in conditions affecting the nature of both the work site and the qualities of the work site supervisor, there were a number of issues on which general – although not unanimous – consensus was found. A number of these are identified and discussed below.

YETP Work Site Supervision: Distinctiveness of the Problem

There was high agreement that one goal of YETP work site supervision must be to assure at least as high a *quality* of supervision as currently is found for regular cooperative work experience programs conducted as part of vocational education. There were two major problems raised by participants associated with attaining that goal. The first is that YETP youth – unlike students enrolled in regular cooperative work experience programs – do not enter the work experience portion of their training equipped with a set of specific vocational skills that will make them productive for the employer. Instead, YETP youth enter into work experience with few, if any, such skills. The second problem is that the stated legal goals of YETP work experience are oriented primarily around helping youth acquire general employability skills – including good work attitudes – and to improve their readiness to make sound career decisions. This is a different basic set of purposes than those associated with typical cooperative work study programs conducted under vocational education. This, in turn, necessarily makes for a different definition of the term "*quality* work experience." That is, the basic purpose is *not* to sharpen an already existing set of specific vocational skills, but rather the basic purpose relates to individual career development of the YETP youth.

While recognizing these two basic differences, other participants, Bob Struble (CETA – Portland, Oregon) was a good example, argued strongly that these kinds of distinctions pertain much more to attitudes of work site supervisors than they do to the basic kinds of activities found in the actual work experience itself. Several participants, including Concepcion Beltran (SEA – Puerto Rico), emphasized the point that, if the work experience is to be *meaningful* to YETP youth, then those youth must see that they actually *do* something – i.e., that something much more than "shadowing" or "observation" must be involved. In this sense, *any* work site supervisor is, in a generic sense, primarily concerned about providing youth with some vocational skills – with showing them how to *do* something.

It was further argued that, while the basic attitudes of YETP work site supervisors should differ considerably from those of other kinds of work site supervisors (because of the unique career development goals of YETP itself) there remains a *general* set of work site supervisor attitudes that make a real

difference in *quality* of the work experience. There was *not* universal agreement among participants that the special goals of YETP make for *great* differences in desired work sites or desired qualities of work site supervisors. Some were found on both sides of this argument.

There was, at the same time, very high agreement that the goals of YETP work experience, in terms of expected benefits to YETP youth, include: (a) a set of positive work attitudes; (b) a set of general employability skills; (c) a set of career exploration opportunities; (d) further development of career goals; and (e) a feeling of increased self-worth through knowing that one has accomplished something in a successful manner. There seemed to be no disagreement on these points.

Criticisms Leveled at YETP Work Site Supervisors: The Need for Training

The proper perspective for use in reading this section is a realization that *most* participants had far more praise to give their work site supervisors than blame to level at them. At the same time, numerous instances of the need for increasing the quality and competence of YETP work site supervisors surfaced during the discussions. The following list summarizes the criticisms voiced most frequently:

1. Some YETP work site supervisors are more worried about getting *their* job done than about providing YETP youth with a good learning situation.
2. Some work site supervisors are basically *negative* persons who spend too much time talking about what's wrong with their jobs rather than helping youth see the positive side.
3. Some work site supervisors don't keep YETP youth busy.
4. Some YETP work site supervisors won't fill out the reports required under YETP—even though they may be excellent in working with individual YETP youth and deserve to be retained.
5. Some YETP work site supervisors refuse to read the training and orientation materials for YETP that are given to them.
6. Some YETP work site supervisors—especially those employed in the private sector—insist that they don't have time to attend YETP training sessions for work site supervisors.
7. Some work site supervisors neither understand—nor do they care—about the goals of YETP in terms of benefits expected to accrue to youth.
8. Some work site supervisors aren't used to being "employers"—and so don't know how to develop an employer-employee relationship with the YETP youth they supervise.
9. Some YETP work site supervisors aren't trainable.

10. Some YETP work site supervisors see CETA as a "boondoggle" and not worthy of the kinds of careful work site supervision given youth in regular vocational education programs.

Each of the criticisms listed above was expressed frequently enough so as to indicate no doubt about its existence. Obviously, the goal of putting *quality* into YETP work site supervision will be difficult to attain so long as conditions such as listed above exist. On several occasions, when criticism was voiced, participants accompanied such criticisms with expressions of the kinds of attitudes they feel are necessary in order to make the YETP work experience a quality effort *consistent with the basic purposes and goals of YETP*. A summary of participant recommendations with respect to the kinds of positive attitudes they are seeking may be helpful here. Such a summary would include each of the following attitudes of good YETP work site supervisors:

1. These YETP youth are being *loaned* to you so that *you* can provide them with some of the positive skills and attitudes they need.
2. You, as a YETP work site supervisor, should function as a paraprofessional counselor to YETP youth—be interested in listening to the problems and concerns of YETP youth.
3. You, as a YETP work site supervisor, should see yourself as an extension of the YETP in-school staff—not as a separate entity from that staff. What goes on where you are affects YETP youth's school work.
4. You, as a YETP work site supervisor, should possess a set of altruistic attitudes that lead you to be really concerned about and desirous of helping *economically disadvantaged youth*.
5. Your relationship with YETP youth should be much more that of a "Big Brother" than that of a "boss." The message you should give YETP youth is "I'm here to help you"—*not* "Do as I say."
6. Try to serve as a good *role model* for YETP youth. Play up the good parts of your work and the importance of your job.

The basic focus of discussion was centered around how to go from some of the negative attitudes currently held by some YETP work site supervisors to the more positive kinds of attitudes summarized above. This obviously led to a discussion of the topic of how to provide needed training to YETP work site supervisors. We turn now to a discussion of that problem.

Training YETP Work Site Supervisors

It was recognized, throughout the discussions, that "training" is, by no means, the sole solution needed in order to improve the quality of YETP youth's work experience. Other variables—to be discussed in later subsections for this general topic—are also important. Yet, the problem of providing appropriate training to YETP work site supervisors was recognized as a major part of the needed solution. Several obstacles to providing such

needed training were provided by participants including: (a) work site supervisors in private sector settings often can't be released to participate in such training; (b) some work site supervisors will resist any attempts to provide them with training that involves reading because their reading skills are either minimal or nonexistent; and (c) overhead costs associated with providing training to YETP work site supervisors are high and, unless funds from other parts of CETA can be made available, may be impossible to obtain. In spite of practical constraints such as these, the *need* for training of YETP work site supervisors was clearly agreed to by almost all participants.

In several discussions, participants attempted to make lists of topics that should be included in the training of YETP work site supervisors. A composite listing of all possible topics suggested by these participants consists of the following:

1. The basic nature and goals of CETA—with special emphasis on the basic nature and goals of YETP.
2. The kinds of paperwork work site supervisors are required to complete—and how to do so.
3. The necessity of viewing YETP work site supervision as aimed at *training* rather than at *productivity*.
4. Grievance procedures provided for in YETP—with special emphasis on how YETP youth can file grievances.
5. The role and responsibilities of the work site supervisor.
6. What youth are expected to learn at the work site.
7. What the YETP work site supervisor should expect of YETP youth.
8. Nature of the specific work site agreement.
9. Discussion of pay days and payroll procedures in YETP.
10. What to do in case of an accident on the job.
11. Who to call—and how to call—some responsible person in the CETA office in case of any kind of emergency.
12. Basic methods and techniques of good supervision.
13. How to "interview" YETP youth being considered for the work site.
14. How to help YETP youth learn by doing in their work experience.
15. How to show YETP youth why the job is important.

Obviously, since the above list is a composite of all specific suggestions made by participants, there is some overlap among the 15 topics included in the list. In spite of this, the list itself may be helpful to those who ask questions regarding the kinds of training needed by YETP work site supervisors. This training *is* being conducted in many of the communities represented in this series of miniconferences.

Sometimes, this training is done completely by the LEA (Akron, Ohio is a good example). At other times, the LEA provides some training during the school year while CETA persons assume responsibility for supplementing that training during Summer months (Portland, Oregon is a good example here). In still other places, training of YETP work site supervisors is considered to be

a joint responsibility of LEA and of CETA persons. Baton Rouge, Louisiana is a good example here. There, Conway Knighton (LEA) reported that a general orientation training session is held early in the school year followed by quarterly meetings during the school year. Both CETA and LEA staff persons conduct training sessions—sometimes separately and sometimes in joint presentations. Work site supervisors attending these training sessions come from LEA, PSE, and Private Sector settings. The quarterly meetings during the year are devoted to allowing work site supervisors to report their experiences and to exchange reports with each other as well as critiquing each other's reports.

Not nearly all training of YETP work site supervisors is being carried on through formal classroom approaches. In Seattle, Washington, for example, Gordon Roff (LEA) reports using what, essentially, is an OJT approach to training YETP work site supervisors. This procedure begins with the job development section of his YETP intake unit who perform the first negotiations with work site supervisors and do the initial writeups. YETP case workers are then sent from the LEA to the actual work site to develop and carry out working relationships with the YETP work site supervisor. This includes carrying out sets of materials such supervisors can use in doing a better job with YETP youth. Finally, this system includes a "hot line" that any YETP work site supervisor can use in calling to the LEA's YETP program when any kinds of questions arise. The entire operation is done basically as an individual "on-the-job" (OJT) training. Bill Kearney (LEA—Wilmington, Delaware) reported that, because 75-80% of his YETP work site supervisors are in the private sector, he, too, has found it necessary to use a "1 on 1 OJT" approach to training such supervisors.

A major worry, expressed by a number of participants, centered around finding the time needed to do training of YETP work site supervisors. The most common suggestion was to look for that period of time between when the Summer SYEP program ends and the Fall YETP program begins.

The special problem of providing training to YETP work site supervisors employed in the private sector was mentioned previously as one raised by Bill Kearney from Wilmington, Delaware. The same problem was reenforced later in that miniconference by Sherman Crisden (CETA—Wilmington, Delaware). The problem in Wilmington is that 75-80% of YETP youth receive their work experience in the private sector. Obviously, under such conditions, the problem of how to get needed training to YETP work site supervisors differs from those communities where YETP work experience is conducted primarily within PSE settings.

The Work Site as A Factor in Quality of Work Site Supervision

Quality work site supervision can best occur when quality work sites are made available to YETP youth. There was very high agreement among par-

ticipants on this point. There was disagreement, however, about how to define a "quality work site."

Part of this disagreement stemmed from an apparent perception, among some participants, that "quality work sites" are found only in the private sector. Those voicing such opinions tended to point to the fact that, when economically disadvantaged youth are placed in work sites within the Public Service Employment (PSE) sector, they are, in effect, seeing only that part of the occupational society with which they are already very familiar. That is, their *parents* are, typically, clients of the PSE agencies where the youth are assigned to work. Others noted that, in many PSE settings, it is difficult to find many adult role models who are, themselves, practicing the kinds of good work habits and expressing the kinds of positive attitudes toward work that we hope to provide for YETP youth. The inevitable result is to lock the youth still more into the PSE sector of our total society. Other participants disagreed with this point of view and emphasized that, in the PSE setting, it is relatively easy to show youth that what they are being asked to do is really needed in our society—and thus *may* be more positive than some work sites in the private sector. Moreover, some contended that YETP youth *need* some PSE work experiences in order to ready themselves for work experience in the private sector.

Some participants pointed to work sites within the LEA itself as basically negative in nature while others looked upon such sites very favorably. Those critical of using the public schools as work sites for YETP youth centered most of their criticism around the fact that youth, in such settings, are typically assigned to such low level tasks as sweeping floors. The contention was that, even if sweeping floors *could* be considered a form of career exploration, it certainly wouldn't take long to explore it! Further, they pointed out that YETP's goal of providing youth with *personally meaningful* work experience is very difficult to meet in many public school settings. Those who favored using public schools as work experience sites for YETP youth pointed out that possibilities of providing close and effective relationships with the work site supervisors themselves offset some of the disadvantages. Furthermore, transportation costs and problems are avoided.

The private sector itself was not spared criticism as a potentially good work site by these participants. While most seemed to favor trying to obtain work sites for YETP youth in the private sector, others raised objections such as: (a) organized labor will complain if these youth are assigned productive work—and, if the work they are assigned isn't productive, it won't be meaningful to the youth; (b) some employers complain if their competitors get "free help" while they don't; (c) some YETP youth have been assigned "jobs" in the private sector which, in fact, wouldn't even exist were it not for the YETP program—i.e., they are not *real* jobs at all; and (d) many employers in the private sector don't want to take YETP youth for only two hours per day (as they are typically assigned in YETP).

Thus, it is obvious that whether one speaks about public service employment, the public schools, or the private sector, there are some experienced practitioners who find things wrong with each of them. Instead of "choosing" one over another, participants seemed more concerned about making up a set of suggestions which, if implemented, would help assure *quality* of work experience in *any* kind of setting. The composite of the set of suggestions made is as follows:

1. Insist that YETP proposals include a specific description of what YETP youth will be *doing* in their work experience—and then implement an effective monitoring system to make sure that conditions found in the proposal are being followed.
2. When unsatisfactory work site supervisors are discovered, replace them quickly—many others are available Wilma Jackson (CETA—Jackson, Mississippi) made this suggestion.
3. Make the ratio of work site supervisors to YETP youth no higher than 1:2. *Quality* supervision can't be done if one work site supervisor has a higher ratio than this.
4. Orient YETP youth to the work experience portion of YETP prior to placing them in a work site. It is crucial that they know what is expected of *them* and the kinds of things they are supposed to be learning.
5. Orient YETP youth with respect to grievance procedures and how to file grievances. Make sure that work site supervisors know that YETP youth have had such an orientation.
6. Assign youth to work sites using a mock "job interview" procedure under conditions where both the work site supervisor *and* the YETP youth have an opportunity to refuse to work with one another.
7. Provide some kind of organized, effective way of recognizing and honoring good work site supervisors at least once during each year.
8. Rotate YETP youth, on a periodic basis, in such a way that the broadest possible range of careers to explore, consistent with their expressed career interests, can be provided.

Two of these recommendations are deserving of some special elaboration here. The idea of providing some kind of organized means of recognizing—and of rewarding—work site supervisors came up in three miniconferences. Ideas for doing so spring, apparently, from recognition of the fact that most YETP work site supervisors receive no pay for their work—at least this is the impression participants seemed to have. Some such work site supervisors have been engaged in work site supervision for 10 or more years (usually as part of vocational education) and many have never received any kind of recognition or expression of community appreciation for their efforts. Ideas for providing such recognition ranged all the way from holding a special recognition dinner in the local community—to special Governor's awards to be made based on statewide competition—to one suggestion that a "Work Site Supervisors Recognition Reception" be held annually on the White House lawn with the

President personally greeting each State "winner." Other participants reacted quite negatively to this idea by pointing out that YETP dollars are intended to be expended primarily for youth wages and benefits. They feared that any kind of special recognition event for work site supervisors that took some YETP or CETA-general funds would be subject to a great deal of community criticism.

The second one of the recommendations listed above that deserves some special discussion is the one pertaining to providing YETP youth with some planned variation in work experience sites. Those making this recommendation included one participant who pointed out that, to many YETP youth, the amount of money they are paid is a very important matter. Some such youth can find themselves involved in YETP from age 14 through age 18 without ever receiving an increase in wages. If left in a single work site long enough to find a brand new YETP youth enter that work site—and at the same wage they are getting—it is bound to be discouraging to some. Furthermore, it was point out that, if the legal goals of YETP are to be met, some variation in work sites seems definitely to be called for.

In summary, it is obvious that the subject of work sites and work site supervision for YETP youth is a very serious concern to the kinds of LEA and CETA persons selected to attend these miniconferences. If it is this important to these persons, it must be even more so in sites considered to be less exemplary in nature.

Evaluating YETP Efforts

The general topic of "evaluating YETP" was selected as a priority item for discussion in only two of the 15 miniconferences in this series. It was discussed, in a tangential manner, in several others concerned specifically with awarding academic credit. Most other miniconferences in this series found no discussion of the topic of how—and when—to evaluate YETP efforts. Because of the limited discussion of this important topic, it is not necessary to discuss it using a series of subtopics as was done for other sections of this monograph.

Participants who discussed this topic seemed intent on making clear distinctions in meaning between the terms "monitoring" and "evaluation." In general, they regarded the "monitoring" function as one aimed at discovering the extent to which all items in the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement were, in fact, being carried out as stated in the Agreement. By "evaluation," they meant to imply an assessment of how *well* the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement was accomplishing its stated goals.

There was high agreement, among participants, that much assistance is needed, from top persons in both Education and in CETA, regarding both the "monitoring" and the "evaluation" functions. While they reported some help present in the new CETA guidelines they had recently been given

61

(remember, these discussions were held in the Spring of 1979) they did not feel these guidelines to be sufficient for answering their questions. They seemed well aware of the fact that LEA persons and CETA persons are supposed to work "collaboratively" in performing monitoring and evaluation functions, but they seemed very unsure how, in doing so, they could keep an appropriate focus on the "We" dimension—i.e., joint accountability—as opposed to simply finding ways to blame each other for apparent global failures in the total YETP effort.

Further, it was pointed out that, while "monitoring units" are now a required part of the CETA Prime Sponsor's office, that same office is also charged with performing "evaluations." To complicate matters still further, other personnel in the CETA Prime Sponsor's office are charged with "Planning" and "Program Operations." There seemed to be general—although not unanimous consensus that "planning and program operations" should be clearly separated from "monitoring and evaluation." That is, it does not seem reasonable to establish a system where those responsible for performing a task should be the same persons charged with saying how well that task was carried out!

One suggestion, made by Walter Wolfe (CETA—Silver Spring, Md.), was that the 10 criteria in the original YEDPA Knowledge Development Plan could be used as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the YETP effort. To do so would clearly differentiate "evaluation" from the four different kinds of "monitoring" Walt reported he is now being required, by CETA, to perform.

An example of a community where formal evaluation of YETP has already been well established is Boston, Massachusetts. There, Al McMahill (CETA—Boston) pointed to the fact that, because earlier laws—such as those concerned with desegregation—had already mandated outside evaluations of their efforts, a number of firms specializing in conducting evaluation studies have sprung up. In Boston, the CETA Prime Sponsor's office constructed a Request for Proposal (RFP) for YETP evaluation and sent it out to 20-30 consulting firms in the Greater Boston area. When responses came in, the LEA and the CETA Prime Sponsor offices looked at these responses *together* and made a *joint* decision regarding which firm was to get the contract. The RFP called for the evaluation firm to evaluate both the LEA *and* the Prime Sponsor operations in YETP as a single operation. An interesting portion of this RFP called for the LEA portion of the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement to also be evaluated along with LEA career education efforts in Boston with a view toward answering the question of "What services are we getting from whom—at what cost—and with what kinds of quality?"

Considerable discussion was generated among participants based on the fact that, while YETP emphasizes "EMPLOYABILITY" skills, the CETA reporting forms still emphasize "EMPLOYMENT." Linda Harvey (Governor's Office—Mississippi), for example, pointed out that the so-called

"Employability Development Plans" of CETA appear to be placing their primary emphasis on finding and getting youth into immediately available job slots—*not* on equipping youth with a set of general employability skills. As a result, these plans are, according to Linda, being translated in some communities to mean "FIND A JOB—QUICK—FOR THIS ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH." This is obviously not what the YETP legislation intended to be the primary purpose of YETP.

Almost universal agreement was found among participants that evaluation of YETP efforts should focus heavily on assessing the extent to which YETP youth have, in fact, acquired the "general employability skills" called for by YETP. There was also high agreement that: (a) employers will be favorably impressed if we can demonstrate that YETP youth have acquired such skills; and (b) it should be possible to "sell" those CETA decisionmakers responsible for constructing, collecting, and analyzing YETP reporting forms that an emphasis on "employability skills" should be included in such forms.

There was much less agreement when the subject of how to assess "employability skills" was discussed. Some participants felt that the only legitimate way such assessments could be made would be to compare, in a classical experimental/control model, two groups of YETP eligible youth—one of which has been allowed to participate in YETP for a year or more and the other which has been denied the opportunity to participate in YETP. Other participants, while not worried about the evaluation design question, were very worried about what they perceived to be a lack of suitable instruments available for assessing "employability skills." Some LEA participants from the career education area assured them that such instruments are now available in at least minimally acceptable form and are being used to evaluate portions of career education. This caused other participants to express a fear that, if such instruments were used, YETP might be compared to "career education" and, because career education includes much more than economically disadvantaged youth, might make YETP look bad.

In both of the miniconferences where this topic was discussed, participants spent some time proposing criteria for use in evaluating the effectiveness of YETP. A composite of the suggestions made by these participants includes the following criteria:

1. A person who has completed YETP should
   a. Have a career plan
   b. Possess general employability skills
   c. Be able to find a job in his/her own in private sector
2. Increase in frequency of attendance in the LEA
3. Increase in Grade Point Average in the LEA
4. Decrease in tardiness within the LEA
5. Increase in career awareness and career decisionmaking skills.

Generation of criteria such as these provoked considerable discussion. Several participants objected to using, as a criterion of YETP effectiveness,

that each YETP "graduate" should have a clear career plan. They pointed out that, while YETP's purposes include a strong emphasis on career exploration, YETP does not, in any way, seek to pin the youth down to only one career plan. On the contrary, the goals of YETP are much more in the direction of opening up still more career options for the youth to consider—*not* in narrowing his options down to a single career choice.

While, as stated earlier, there was general acceptance of the desirability of using "general employability skills" as a prime criterion for evaluation of YETP, several participants expressed doubts that all YETP youth would be able to read the kinds of standardized instruments available for assessing such skills that are on the market today. Moreover, they felt it very important to obtain ratings of general employability skills for YETP youth from their work site supervisors. There seemed to be good general agreement that the YETP work site supervisor should be involved in evaluation of the YETP effort—but no examples were given of how this is done.

Thus, when the topic of "evaluating YETP" came up, it is obvious that discussion centered primarily around the cognitive/substantive goals of YETP. No participant suggested including *process* goals in YETP evaluations—including, for example, such things as assessing the extent to which LEA/Prime Sponsor professional working relationships have been improved. It would certainly seem that, eventually, both a cognitive and a process approach to YETP evaluation will be formulated and put into operation.

Concluding Thoughts

Practitioners aren't perfect, but they are often very perceptive. The examples of practice and recommendations found in this monograph have been drawn from the thoughts and experiences of 135 practitioners—half LEA persons and half CETA persons—from 71 communities scattered throughout the Nation. Each of these persons had major YETP program implementation responsibilities at the time she/he attended one of the 15 miniconferences in this series. The topics discussed were obviously varied in nature—and even more varied in terms of opinions of participants.

An attempt has been made here to report, insofar as possible, both sides of the "argument" with respect to each major issue raised. Hopefully, this has been done without "taking sides" in the argument. No single sub-topic, obviously, is discussed in great detail in this monograph. It was felt better to identify and summarize each of the major priority issues selected by participants than to attempt to select out a few of them for extensive discussion.

No attempt has been made here to present the suggested solutions of these participants as anything more than what works for them. They have had to "invent" these answers for themselves in order to carry out their job assignments. It is hoped that some who can afford the luxury of more

deliberate and unbiased reflection will conclude that there is some substance in the thoughts and the recommendations of these practitioners. The voice of the practitioner in YETP deserves to be heard.

Participants

Ms. Jean C. Abbott
Coordinator, C.E.E. Program
Aynor/Conway Career Center
Route 8, Box 343
Conway, South Carolina 29526

Mr. Ed Andrews
Assistant Operations Manager
Providence CETA Administration
40 Fountain Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Mr. Joe A. Baird
Postsecondary Occupational
Program Coordinator and
Program Director
Public Service Occupations
Arizona Department of Education
Division of Special Program Services
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Mr. Robert W. Bassard
Work Experience/
CETA Coordinator
Hacienda La Puente Unified
School District
15359 E. Proctor Avenue
City of Industry, California 91744

Mr. Concepcion Beltran
Administrator, EMP Program
Department of Education Office
Room #409
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00918

Ms. Florence Brady
Counselor/Career Consultant
Haddon Township High School
Memorial Avenue
Westmont, New Jersey 08108

Dr. Robert G. Brooks
Administrator
Adult, Career, and Vocational
Education
Providence School Department
86 Fourth Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02906

Mr. James D. Calder
Director, CETA/BOS
Nevada Employment Security
Department
500 E. Third Street
Carson City, Nevada 89713

Mr. John Carney
Administrative Assistant for
Youth Programs
Employment and Training Center
455 North Main Street—12th Floor
City Hall
Wichita, Kansas 67202

Ms. Cynthia Conwell
Project Director, Triple E
Education Collaborative for
Greater Boston
20 Kent Street
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

Mr. Sherman Crisden
Manpower Youth Planner
800 French Street
City-County Building,
Seventh Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Mr. Jay J. Czar
Manpower Planner
City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo Co.
302 Sixth Street, Northwest
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Mr. Michael E. Druley
Project Director
Clinton County YETP Program
1 Meich Road
Frankfort, Indiana 46041

Mr. Ronald T. Finnegan
Project Director
CYET
St. Paul Independent School District #625
Baker School, 821 Raymond Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55114

Mr. John Fitzsimmons
Youth Coordinator
Cumberland County CETA
107 Elm Street
Portland, Maine 04101

Mr. Robert Griffith
Supervisor, YETP
West Virginia Department of Education
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Ms. Linda S. Harvey
Assistant Director, Youth Program Monitoring
Governor's Office, Job Development and Training
P.O. Box 22802
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Mr. Craig Heninger
Planner
Weber County Office of Support Services
Department of Employment and Training
Weber-Morgan CETA Consortium
Ogden, Utah 84403

Mr. James S. Hensley
Coordinator of Career Education
Edinburg Consolidated Independent School District
P.O. Box 990
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Ms. Mary Kay Hoff
Program Coordinator for State Board and Technical Education/CETA
401 Illinois Building
17 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Mr. Willie Horsely
Program Supervisor
Kansas City Public Schools
1211 McGee Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Ms. Ana Maria Huerta
Youth Services Division Director
County of Hidalgo
Department of Community Affairs
P.O. Box 1166
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Mrs. Wilma Jackson
Job Development Coordinator—YETP
Jackson Manpower Consortium
750 N. Congress Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39202

Ms. Jorja K. Jacobs
Career Education Coordinator
Education Services Coordinator
Tulsa Public Schools
P.O. Box 45208
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

Dr. Thomas J. Jacobson
Director, Grants and Contracts/
School Improvement
Grossmont Union High School
District
Box 1043
1100 Murray Drive
La Mesa, California 92041

Mr. J. Ray Jarrett
Director of Vocational Education
Weber School District
1122 Washington Boulevard
Ogden, Utah 84404

Mr. Fred Kaufman
Superintendent of Schools
Program Director, CETA-YETP
Plattsmouth Community Schools
2101 S. 15th Street
Plattsmouth, Nebraska 68048

Mr. Walter M. Kearney
Project Coordinator
Youth Employment Demonstration
Project
Howard High School, Room 101
13th and Poplar Streets
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Ms. Sandra Kelly
Program Planner/Coordinator
Snohomish County Youth Work
Experience Program
4730 Colby Avenue
Everett, Washington 98203

Mr. Conway Knighton
Youth Coordinator
215 St. Louis Street
Suite 203
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801

Ms. Esther Korin
Board of Cooperative Educational
Services
61 Parrott Road
West Nyack, New York 10994

Mr. L. L. Livingston
Director of Curriculum
Delta County Joint School District
No. 50
765 2075 Road
Delta, Colorado 81416

Mr. Albert R. McMahill
Manager of the Educational
Services Unit
Youth Services Department
Employment and Economic Policy
Administration
15 Beacon Street—Fourth Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Mr. Terry Mehail
CETA/YETP Project Counselor
Division of Curriculum and
Instruction
Milwaukee Public Schools
5225 W. Vliet Street,
P.O. Drawer 10K
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Ms. Elaine E. Metzger
Director of Planning—CETA
The Jason Building
181 Middle Street—Room 203
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604

Mr. Sherm Olson
CETA
City Hall
202 Union Street
4th Floor
Memphis, Tennessee 38103

63

Mr. Don Parsons
Director, Vocational Education Project
Educational Services
P.O. Box 398
Flagstaff, Arizona 86002

Ms. Joan Podraza
YETP Youth Representative
Balance of State CETA
610 Miderson Bldg.
12 & O Streets
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Mrs. Barbara Preli
Director, Career Education
Jefferson County Schools
Brown Education Center, Room 508
Fourth and Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky 40059

Mr. Tim Reagan
Deputy Director of Employment and Training
Employment and Economic Policy Administration (CETA)
15 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Mr. Polo M. Rivera
Education Program Specialist
Adult Vocational Serivces
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Mr. Gordon Roff
Program Manager
Seattle Public Schools Work Training Program
4416 Wallingford Avenue, North
Seattle, Washington 98109

Mrs. Jama Roman
Career Development Supervisor
Toledo Public Schools
Manhattan Blvd. at Elm Street
Toledo, Ohio 43608

Ms. Frances Rosen
Career Education Coordinator
Sacramento City Unified School District
P.O. Box 2271
Sacramento, California 95810

Mr. John Sedey
Director of Vocational Education, Pupil Personnel Services and Alternative Programs
Mounds View Schools
2959 North Hamline Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55113

Mr. Robert Struble
Youth Program Planner
Human Resources Bureau
522 Southwest Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

Mr. Thomas Thielman
Senior Manpower Program Coordinator
Rensselaer County Office Guilding
1600 Seventh Avenue
Troy, New York 12180

Mr. Gary L. Tuck
Youth Employment Coordinator
City of Portland Schools
3830 Southeast 14th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97202

Ms. Betty Tumlinson
Director, Youth Employment
Service Center (YES)
2629 East Central
Wichita, Kansas 67214

Mr. David Wasson
Project Director
Mohave County Career Education
Project
5150 W. Beale
Kingman, Arizona 86401

Ms. Marilyn Wiltz
Vocational counselor
Mukilteo School District
Mariner High School
200 120th Street, S.W.
Everett, Washington 98204

Mr. Walter Wolfe
Program Assistant YETP
Montgomery County Division of
Labor Services
8115 Fenton Street
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Mr. James Woodberry
Program Administrator, CETA
Out-of-School Programs
Vocational Education Center
240 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06501

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1981—329-463